BEFORE THE

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD POLICY, RESEARCH, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER OF THE:

)

POLICY, RESEARCH AND

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

COMMITTEE MEETING

)

DATE AND TIME: TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1996

9:30 A.M.

PLACE: BOARD HEARING ROOM

8800 CAL CENTER DRIVE SACRAMENTO,

CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, RPR, CSR

CERTIFICATE NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 36731

APPEARANCES

- MR. PAUL RELIS, CHAIRMAN
- MR. DANIEL G. PENNINGTON, MEMBER
- MS. JANET GOTCH, MEMBER

STAFF PRESENT

- MR. RALPH CHANDLER, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MS. KATHRYN TOBIAS, LEGAL COUNSEL
- MS. DONNELL DUCLO, COMMITTEE SECRETARY
- MS. DOROTHY RICE

MS. CAREN TRGOVCICH

| INDEX | |
|---|-------------|
| P | AG |
| E | _N |
| | <u>_</u> |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | • |
| - | |
| - | - |
| - | |
| CALL TO ORDER AND EX PARTES | 5, |
| ITEM 1: CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF | |
| CONTRACT REPORTS PREPARED BY THE UNIVERSI | ΤΥ |
| OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS, ON DOMESTIC AND FORE | IGN |
| MARKETS FOR CALIFORNIA'S USED AND WASTE TI | RES |
| | |
| STAFF PRESENTATION PUBLIC TESTIMONY | 7 |
| COMMITTEE DISCUSSION | 10 |
| ACTION | 22 |
| ACTION | 22 |
| ITEM 2: CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATE OPTIONS TO ADDRESS WASTE TIRE MANAGEMENT ISSUES | IVE |
| STAFF PRESENTATION | 24 |
| ITEM 3: CONSIDERATION OF POLICY OPTIONS CONCERNING REIMBURSEMENT OF PROPES OWNERS FOR TIRE PILE CLEANUP COSTS | RTY |
| STAFF PRESENTATION | 33 |
| PUBLIC TESTIMONY | 36 |
| COMMITTEE DISCUSSION | 34 |
| COMMITTEE DISCUSSION | 34 |
| ITEM 4: CONSIDERATION OF TIRE PROGRAM FUNDING ALLOCATIONS | 1 |
| STAFF PRESENTATION | 39 |
| PUBLIC TESTIMONY: | |
| | 5, |
| | ٦, |
| 96 | 1.0 |
| BARBER | 46 |
| HARRINGTON | 47 |
| WARNER | 54 |
| LAX | 56 |
| BRYNE | 60 |
| MICHAEL | 66 |
| | |

| | PANDZA | 69 |
|-----|----------------------|----|
| | SCHWARTZ | 74 |
| | RAYNER | 84 |
| | TAKALLOU | 91 |
| | BENNETT | 93 |
| | COMMITTEE DISCUSSION | |
| 100 | | |
| | ACTION | |
| 124 | | |
| | | |
| | ADJOURNMENT | |
| 129 | | |

| 1 | SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA |
|----------|---|
| 2 | TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5TH, 1996 |
| 3 | 9:30 A.M. |
| 4 | |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN RELIS: WE'LL CALL TO ORDER THE |
| 6 | POLICY, RESEARCH, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE |
| 7 | COMMITTEE. DONNELL, WOULD YOU PLEASE CALL THE |
| 8 | ROLL. |
| 9 | THE SECRETARY: MEMBER GOTCH. |
| 10 | MEMBER GOTCH: HERE. |
| 11 | THE SECRETARY: PENNINGTON. |
| 12 | MEMBER PENNINGTON: HERE. |
| 13 | THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN RELIS. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN RELIS: HERE. OKAY. BEFORE WE |
| 15 | GO ANY FURTHER, I'D LIKE TO ACKNOWLEDGE. YOU'VE |
| 16 | SEEN OUR FLAG IS AT HALF MAST BECAUSE ONE OF OUR |
| 17 | STAFF, JOHN PECHAL, DIED JUST SEVERAL DAYS AGO, |
| 18 | AND THERE WILL BE A MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR HIM |
| 19 | TOMORROW, AND WE WOULD JUST LIKE TO TAKE A MOMENT |
| 20 | OF SILENCE IN HIS MEMORY. |
| 21 | (MOMENT OF SILENCE). |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN RELIS: FIRST, BEFORE WE GET |
| 23 | INTO BUSINESS, ARE THERE ANY EX PARTES TO |
| 24 25 | COMMUNICATE FROM BOARD MEMBERS? MEMBER GOTCH: I HAVE A COUPLE OF THEM. |

- 1 SEVERAL BRIEF CONVERSATIONS THIS MORNING, ONE WITH
- 2 ROBERT SCHWARTZ OF ALL AMERICAN ASPHALT, REGARDING
- 3 L.A. COUNTY'S PROPOSAL, WHICH IS ITEM NO. 4 ON
- 4 TODAY'S AGENDA. ALSO, A BRIEF HELLO FROM JOHN
- 5 LORMON REGARDING MR. DILLINGHAM AND ITEM NO. 3 ON
- 6 TODAY'S AGENDA. A HELLO FROM JACK MICHAEL, L.A.
- 7 COUNTY'S PROPOSAL, ITEM NO. 4, FUNDING
- 8 ALLOCATIONS, AND THEN ALSO AN INTRODUCTION BY
- 9 JOLENE PANDZA OF AMERICAN TIRE DISPOSAL.
- 10 MEMBER PENNINGTON: NO, MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 11 MINE ARE ALL ENTERED IN THE LOG.
- 12 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I'LL NOTE FOR THE RECORD
- 13 THAT TWO COMMUNICATIONS WERE RECEIVED, ONE FROM
- 14 PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH. AND LET'S
- 15 SEE, THIS CONCERNS THE INNOCENT LANDOWNER
- 16 REIMBURSEMENT POLICY. THAT'S DATED NOVEMBER 4TH.
- 17 AND ANOTHER COMMUNICATION ALSO DATED NOVEMBER 4TH
- 18 FROM THE CALIFORNIA CEMENT MANUFACTURERS
- 19 ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION CONCERNING ITEM NO. 1.
- OKAY. NOW WE'LL PROCEED. AND, MR.
- 21 CHANDLER, DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING?
- 22 MR. CHANDLER: NO, MR. RELIS. I'LL JUST
- 23 TURN IT OVER.
- 24 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. I HAVE SOME
- 25 GENERAL REMARKS I'D LIKE TO MAKE AT THIS TIME.

```
1
      FIRST, JUST REVIEWING -- BEFORE -- I'D LIKE TO GO
 2
      INTO A FEW OPENING REMARKS. FIRST, THE EMPHASIS
 3
      THAT WE'RE TAKING UP TODAY, MY COMMENTS WILL BE
      FOCUSED ON ITEM 4. AND BEFORE WE GET TO THAT
 4
      ITEM, BEFORE WE REFER IT TO STAFF, I WOULD LIKE TO
 5
 6
      MAKE SOME GENERAL COMMENTS. AND SO LET'S PROCEED
 7
      WITH ITEM 1, WHICH IS THE REPORT FROM UC DAVIS.
 8
                MS. TRGOVCICH: CORRECT, MR. CHAIRMAN.
 9
      GOOD MORNING, I'M CAREN TRGOVCICH, DEPUTY DIRECTOR
      OF THE WASTE PREVENTION AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT
10
11
      DIVISION.
                     THE ITEM BEFORE YOU THIS MORNING
12
13
      WILL BE PRESENTED BY MARTHA GILDART. WHAT THE
      ITEM IS IS THE PRESENTATION OF A REPORT THAT IS A
14
      RESULT OF AN INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT WITH THE
15
16
      UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS TO LOOK INTO AND
17
      INVESTIGATE THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MARKETS FOR
18
      WASTE TIRES.
                     I'D JUST LIKE TO BRIEFLY REMIND THE
19
20
      COMMITTEE THAT THAT ITEM WAS PRESENTED FOR THE
21
      FIRST TIME TO YOU IN JUNE. THE REPORT WAS FIRST
      PRESENTED PER THE SCOPE OF WORK AND CONTRACT THAT
22
23
      WAS ENTERED INTO. AT THAT TIME THE COMMITTEE
24
      RAISED A SIGNIFICANT ISSUE THAT MARTHA WILL BE
25
      COVERING TODAY AROUND DISCUSSION OF EMISSION
```

1 RESULTS. 2 SUBSEQUENT TO THE PRESENTATION OF 3 THAT REPORT TO THE COMMITTEE, THE UNIVERSITY OF 4 CALIFORNIA DAVIS PROFESSOR SUBMITTED THE FINAL 5 REPORT IN AUGUST OF THIS YEAR. AND IN THAT FINAL 6 SUBMISSION, A NEW AREA OF INVESTIGATION WAS 7 INCLUDED IN THE REPORT, AND THAT WILL ALSO BE 8 CONTAINED IN MARTHA'S DISCUSSION FOR YOU THIS 9 MORNING AS WELL. 10 MS. GILDART: GOOD MORNING. MARTHA 11 GILDART WITH THE WASTE PREVENTION DIVISION. 12 CONTRACT IWMC3119 WAS ENTERED INTO IN JUNE OF 94, 13 AND STAFF WORKED WITH THE CONTRACTOR MONITORING QUARTERLY REPORTS, MEETING WITH THEM REGULARLY 14 ON15 THE PROGRESS OF THE REPORT. AS CAREN INDICATED, 16 IT WAS PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE THIS JUNE, 17 TWO-YEAR CYCLE FOR THE CONTRACT. 18 AT THAT TIME ISSUES WERE BROUGHT UΡ DEALING WITH THE DESCRIPTION OF THE USE OF 19 TIRES

| 20 | AS A FUEL SUPPLEMENT, PARTICULARLY IN CEMENT |
|---------------------|---|
| 21 | KILNS. STAFF INDICATED TO THE CONTRACTOR |
| THERE | |
| 22 | WERE CONCERNS WITH THE TONE OF THE REPORT AND |
| WITH | |
| 23 | SOME OF THE DATA CONTAINED WITHIN. |
| 24 | THE CONTRACTOR WAS WILLING TO |
| WORK 25 MINOR | PAST THE END OF THE CONTRACT TO MAKE SOME |

| 1 | MODIFICATIONS, BUT STAFF WAS ALSO SOMEWHAT |
|-------|--|
| 2 | SURPRISED TO FIND THAT THE AUGUST SUBMITTAL OF |
| 3 | WHAT WAS TO BE THE FINAL REPORT INCLUDED A NEW |
| 4 | SECTION, DISCUSSING THE MERIT OF HEALTH RISK |
| 5 | ASSESSMENT AS A POLICY-MAKING TOOL. |
| 6 | STAFF WAS VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THIS |
| 7 | ADDITION AS THESE PROCEDURES HAVE GONE THROUGH TWO |
| 8 | DECADES OF DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION AND |
| 9 | EVOLUTION AND HAVE BECOME STANDARD AND ACCEPTED |
| 10 | PRACTICE BY MANY STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES, AND WE |
| 11 | FELT THAT THE SCOPE OF SUCH A DISCUSSION WAS NOT |
| 12 | INCLUDED IN THE SCOPE OF WORK AND THAT, INDEED, IT |
| 13 | WOULD NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR ONE STATE AGENCY TO |
| 14 | PUBLISH SUCH A REPORT WHICH CALLED INTO QUESTION |
| 15 | PROCEDURES BY OTHER STATE AGENCIES. |
| 16 | WE SENT NOTICES, LETTERS TO THE |
| 17 | CONTRACTOR, WHO WAS UNABLE TO COME TO THE |
| 18 | COMMITTEE MEETING TODAY. THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION |
| 19 | CONTAINED IN THE ITEM THAT YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU IS |
| 20 | TO FORWARD THE RECOMMENDATION FOR ADOPTION OF THE |
| 21 | DRAFT FINAL REPORT TO THE BOARD WITH A PREFACE |
| 22 | WHICH WOULD INCLUDE A DISCLAIMER ON THE SECTION |
| 23 | DEALING WITH THE EMISSIONS. HOWEVER, STAFF |
| WOULD | |

FURTHER LIKE TO RECOMMEND THAT WE EXPLORE

REMOVAL

OF THE HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION UNTIL

1 SUCH TIME AS SOME AGREEMENT CAN BE REACHED OVER THE COPYRIGHT OF THOSE MATERIALS. 2 3 AT THIS TIME I WOULD LIKE TO ASK 4 KATHRYN TOBIAS TO DESCRIBE THE COPYRIGHT ISSUE. 5 MS. TOBIAS: IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT б THE COPYRIGHT ISSUE IS THAT IN THIS PARTICULAR 7 CONTRACT, UC HAS MAINTAINED THE COPYRIGHT. SO THE 8 BOARD DOES NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO BASICALLY CHANGE 9 THE REPORT WITHOUT THE ACQUIESCENCE OR THE 10 APPROVAL, CONSENT, WHATEVER, OF THE CONTRACTOR 11 WHO'S PREPARED THE REPORT. 12 WE HAVE -- THE LEGAL OFFICE HAS OFFERED TO MEET WITH THE CONTRACTOR AND DISCUSS 13 14 SOME OF THESE COPYRIGHT ISSUES TO TRY TO RESOLVE 15 THIS; BUT SINCE THIS ISSUE JUST CAME UP, THAT'S 16 PRETTY MUCH WHERE WE ARE. 17 CHAIRMAN RELIS: DO YOU GET THE APPROVAL 18 FROM THE AUTHOR OR FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA REGENTS? 19 20 MS. TOBIAS: WELL, THAT'S A GOOD 21 OUESTION. I'M NOT SURE WHO ACTUALLY HOLDS THIS 22 PARTICULAR COPYRIGHT, WHETHER IT IS THE INDIVIDUAL

OR UC. WE WOULD PROBABLY BE WORKING INITIALLY

WITH UC DUE TO SOME VAGARIES IN THE COPYRIGHT

23

LAW

25 AND IN THE CONTRACTING LAW AS WELL.

MEMBER GOTCH: WHAT'S THE TIME LINE FOR 1 THAT? IS THAT SOMETHING WE MIGHT HAVE MORE 2 3 INFORMATION BY THE TIME OF THE BOARD MEETING? 4 MS. TOBIAS: I DON'T THINK SO. MY 5 EXPERIENCE WORKING WITH THE UC SYSTEM IS MONTHS, 6 IF NOT MORE THAN DAYS. IT'S MERELY -- I THINK, 7 YOU KNOW, WHAT WE'RE SAYING, THAT WE COULD 8 PROBABLY, YOU KNOW, TRY GOING IN AND TRYING TO 9 WORK THIS THROUGH, BUT WE HAVEN'T BEEN ASKED TO DO 10 THAT UP UNTIL TODAY. SO I DON'T THINK WE'D BE ABLE TO DO IT BY THE BOARD MEETING. 11 12 MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D 13 RECOMMEND THAT WE REJECT THIS REPORT. IT APPEARS 14 THAT THE CONTRACTOR DID NOT FOLLOW THE SCOPE OF WORK OF THE CONTRACT AND HAS TAKEN THE LIBERTY 15 TO ADD HIS ONLY PERSONAL OPINIONS TO THIS REPORT. 16 17 FURTHER, IN THE FUTURE I'D ASK THAT 18 STAFF NOT RELEASE ANY FINAL PAYMENTS ON CONTRACTS 19 BEFORE REPORTS OR OTHER PRODUCTS HAVE BEEN 20 REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE BOARD, WHEN

REQUIRED.

| 21 | IT IS INAPPROPRIATE FOR A CONTRACTOR TO RECEIVE |
|----------|---|
| 22 | STATE FUNDS WHEN THEY HAVE NOT COMPLETED THE |
| JOB | |
| 23 | ACCORDING TO THE CONTRACT SPECIFICATION AND TO |
| THE | |
| 24 25 | SATISFACTION OF THE BOARD. SO, THEREFORE, I'D MOVE THAT WE |

- 1 REJECT THE REPORT AND THAT WE DIRECT LEGAL
- 2 TO DETERMINE IF WE HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL LEGAL
- 3 REMEDIES TO EITHER RECOVER OUR FUNDS OR TO

FURTHER

STAFF

- 4 EXAMINE THE COPYRIGHT SITUATION.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. IT'S BEEN

MOVED

- 6 THAT WE REJECT THE REPORT. LET'S HAVE SOME
- 7 DISCUSSION. ANY DISCUSSION?
- 8 MEMBER GOTCH: I'M NOT READY TO REJECT
- 9 THE REPORT AT THIS POINT. FROM WHAT I'VE READ

OF

10 IT, IT SEEMS TO SHOW THE BIG PICTURE. I WOULD

BE

11 WILLING TO GIVE MORE TIME TO FIND OUT WHAT

LEGAL

- 12 COMES UP WITH THOUGH.
- 13 CHAIRMAN RELIS: LET ME OFFER A
- 14 PERSPECTIVE ON THIS. HAVING READ THIS

CAREFULLY,

15 IT SEEMS TO ME THERE ARE A COUPLE OF ISSUES.

ONE

16 IS, YES, THERE'S VERY VALUABLE INFORMATION IN

THIS

| 17 | REPORT. AND I THINK WE HAD VERY VALUABLE |
|--------------------|--|
| 18 | INFORMATION FROM THE EARLIER PRESENTATION FROM |
| 19 | DAVIS ON THE OVERALL SUPPLY AND DEMAND AND |
| TRENDS | |
| 20 | IN THE MARKETPLACE. |
| 21 | THIS DISCUSSION SPECIFICALLY ON |
| THE | |
| 22 | ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS OF COMBUSTION AND |
| 23 | EMISSIONS, THAT WAS NOT IN THE PREVIOUS |
| MATERIAL | |
| 24 | THAT I RECALL; IS THAT CORRECT? OR IF IT WAS, |
| IT 25 CORREC | WASN'T DEVELOPED AT THIS LEVEL; IS THAT I? |

1 MS. GILDART: IN THE JUNE REPORT THERE WAS A DISCUSSION OF EMISSIONS, BUT NOT AS MUCH 2 3 DATA AS YOU SEE IN THE CURRENT VERSION. HE DID GO BACK AND INCLUDE TESTS THAT SHOWED BOTH INCREASES 4 AND DECREASES IN A VARIETY OF EMISSIONS. BEFORE 5 6 HE FOCUSED ONLY ON INCREASES. WHAT WAS ALSO NEW 7 IN THE VERSION YOU SEE IS THE HEALTH RISK 8 ASSESSMENT DISCUSSION. 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THAT IS ALL NEW? MS. GILDART: THAT IS ALL NEW. 10 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. 11 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: MR. CHAIRMAN, I 12 13 DON'T KNOW IF THIS IS APPROPRIATE OR NOT, BUT IT MAY BE HELPFUL TO RELATE A CONVERSATION I HAD JUST 14 A FEW MOMENTS AGO WITH MR. DOUG SHUMWAY OF 15 MITSUBISHI CEMENT. AND SOME OF YOU MAY HAVE HAD 16 17 THE SAME PHONE CALL OR MAYBE NOT. 18 AND HIS OBJECTION TO THIS REPORT WAS SPECIFICALLY IN THE SECTION ON PAGE I-10, DEALING 19 20 WITH EMISSIONS. AND JUST TO RELAY HIS 21 CONVERSATION AS ACCURATELY AS I CAN, HE SAID THAT 22 THE TESTS MISSTATE WHAT TOOK PLACE AND THAT 23 SEVERAL OF THESE TESTS WERE CONDUCTED AT THAT 24 THEIR FACILITY, AND THE REPORTS IN THE DOCUMENT 25 ARE QUITE THE REVERSE OF WHAT ACTUALLY OCCURRED.

1 AND HE WAS RAISING THAT OBJECTION. 2 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO HE'S QUESTIONING THE 3 VERACITY OF THIS DISCUSSION BEGINNING --4 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: PARTICULARLY THE 5 NEXT TO THE LAST PARAGRAPH ON PAGE I-10 WHERE IT 6 STATES -- AND I DON'T KNOW IF HE HAS SEEN THIS 7 DOCUMENT. THIS ONE RELATES BOTH INCREASES AND 8 DECREASES. WHETHER HE'S SEEN THIS DOCUMENT OR HE'S REFERRING TO THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT THAT 9 10 SHOWED ONLY INCREASES. 11 MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, COULD I 12 ALSO POINT OUT THAT WE JUST RECEIVED FAX COPIES OF COMMENT LETTERS FROM BOTH THE MOJAVE DESERT AIR 13 14 QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT AS WELL AS THE AIR 15 RESOURCES BOARD YESTERDAY AFTERNOON INDICATING 16 THAT THEY HAVE SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS WITH THESE 17 SECTIONS OF THE REPORT AS WELL. 18 CHAIRMAN RELIS: BOARD MEMBERS DO NOT 19 HAVE COPIES. 20 MS. TRGOVCICH: WE JUST RECEIVED THAT, 21 AND I BELIEVE MARTHA HAS IT TO HAND OUT TO YOU AΤ 22 THIS TIME. 23 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO LET ME PURSUE THIS

JUST A BIT FURTHER. NOW, IN THE CASE OF A

- 1 THE STUDY, REVISE THE STUDY, OR NOT ACCEPT IT.
- 2 AND WHAT HAPPENS WHEN IT'S NOT ACCEPTED? IS IT
- 3 JUST LIKE A PUBLICATION THAT ONE CAN REFERENCE AND
- 4 USE, BUT IT'S NOT AN OFFICIAL DOCUMENT OF THE
- 5 BOARD?
- 6 MR. CHANDLER: THAT'S RIGHT. IT WOULD
- 7 NOT RECEIVE THE BOARD'S PUBLICATION NUMBER. IT
- 8 WOULD NOT CARRY THE BOARD'S TITLE, LOGO, WOULD NOT
- 9 HAVE THE BOARD'S ENDORSEMENT, IF YOU WILL, AS A
- 10 BOARD ACCEPTED DOCUMENT UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF
- 11 THE AGREEMENT. AND IN EFFECT, IT WOULD BE WHAT IT
- 12 IS, WHICH IS A STUDY DRAFTED AND WRITTEN BY A UC
- 13 PROFESSOR WITH SUPPOSED BACKGROUND AND EXPERTISE
- 14 ON THIS MATTER.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RELIS: AND IF WE WERE TO PRESS
- 16 THE ISSUE, FROM WHAT I CAN TELL FROM WHAT WAS SAID
- 17 EARLIER, WE WOULD NEED APPROVAL TO CHANGE ANYTHING
- 18 IN THE REPORT FROM THE UC REGENTS OR UC, MAYBE NOT
- 19 THE REGENTS.
- 20 MS. TOBIAS: RIGHT. AND THERE'S SEVERAL
- 21 DIFFERENT ISSUES HERE. ONE IS THE ACCEPTANCE OF
- 22 THE REPORT TO CLOSE THE CONTRACT. ONE IS THE
- 23 ISSUE OF WHETHER THE BOARD AND, THEREFORE, BOARD
- 24 STAFF CAN AMEND OR OMIT PORTIONS OF THE STUDY.
- 25 THAT'S A COPYRIGHT ISSUE.

- 1 SO REALLY KIND OF HAVE TO SEPARATE 2 OUT THESE DIFFERENT ISSUES. YOU KNOW, IT SOUNDS 3 TO ME LIKE NOT WE'RE REALLY READY TO DO EITHER, ACCEPT IT OR REJECT IT, UNTIL WE FIND OUT WHETHER 4 5 WE CAN DEAL WITH THE COPYRIGHT ISSUE, WHICH WOULD 6 ALLOW STAFF TO DO SOMETHING WITH IT; OR, AS RALPH 7 SAID, BASICALLY CLOSE THE CONTRACT, BUT NOT ACCEPT 8 THE STUDY AS A BOARD STUDY SO THAT YOU DON'T GIVE IT ANY ADDITIONAL VALIDITY. BUT REALLY THERE'S 9 10 TWO DIFFERENT ISSUES AT HAND THAT KIND OF OVERLAP. 11 MEMBER PENNINGTON: WELL, I'M READY TO 12 REJECT IT. HE DIDN'T GIVE US WHAT WE ASKED FOR. HE TOOK OUR MONEY AND DIDN'T GIVE US WHAT WE ASKED 14 FOR. 15 CHAIRMAN RELIS: WELL, I CAN SUPPORT THAT, BUT LET ME TELL YOU WHY I WOULD SUPPORT 16 17 THAT. IT'S MORE THE ISSUE -- WHETHER THESE ISSUES
- 19 THIS REPORT ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT -- PARTICULARLY

ARE -- THERE'RE SOME VERY MAJOR ASSERTIONS MADE

20 ABOUT THE HEALTH RISK OF INCINERATION AS AN

18

IN

- 21 OPTION. I GUESS THAT'S WHAT I PUT AT BOTTOM LINE.
- MS. GILDART: ACTUALLY IT'S EVEN BROADER.
- 23 HE QUESTIONS THE VALUE OF HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT
- 24 AS A DECISION-MAKING TOOL, AS A POLICY TOOL BY 25 POINTING OUT THE ASSUMPTIONS THAT GO INTO A HEALTH

1 RISK ASSESSMENT CALL UPON A WIDE RANGE OF DATA, EMISSIONS DATA, AIR QUALITY MODELING DATA, 2 3 EPIDEMIOLOGICAL DATA, TOXICOLOGICAL DATA. THEY LOOKED AT A MULTIPLICITY OF END POINTS, YOU KNOW, 4 CARCINOGENIC, TERATOGENIC, MUTAGENIC. THERE'S A 5 6 WHOLE SERIES OF ACTIVITIES, EACH OF WHICH HAVE 7 ASSUMPTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH IT. WHAT HAS HAPPENED OVER THE LAST 20 8 9 YEARS IS THAT THE DISCIPLINE HAS COME TO A POINT THEY AGREE TO DO THE SAME SORTS OF ASSUMPTIONS ALL 10 THE WAY THROUGH AND THEN YOU COMPARE THE RESULTS 11 OF ONE HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT TO ANOTHER AND HAVE 12 13 AN IDEA OF THE RELATIVE MERITS. NO ONE SAYS THAT THIS NUMBER IS ABSOLUTE AND REAL VALUE. IT IS A 14 COMPARATIVE TOOL. AND IF YOU CALL INTO QUESTION 15 16 THE VALUE OF THAT WHOLE PROCESS, WE HAVE NOTHING 17 LEFT TO COMPARE. 18 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THAT WOULD APPLY NOT JUST TO THIS STUDY. I MEAN THAT'S THE GENERAL 19 20 FORMAT FOR ALL REGULATORY SCIENTIFIC BASED EVALUATIONS, ISN'T IT? WOULDN'T BE RESTRICTED TO 21 22 THIS ONE? 23 MS. GILDART: THAT BROAD, YES. I THINK

ONE OF THE COMMENTS THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD MADE

ON THE DOCUMENT THAT THEY REVIEWED INDICATES, I

24

THINK, THE LACK OF FAMILIARITY WITH THE SUBJECT ON

1

2 THE PART OF THE CONTRACTOR IS IN INTRODUCTION PAGE 3 I-10. HE TALKS ABOUT DISPERSION MODELS PREDICT AMBIENT CONCENTRATIONS IN POPULATED AREAS NEAR THE 4 5 FACILITY, AND THE EXPOSURE AND RISK OF DEATH ARE 6 CALCULATED FROM GUIDELINES THAT CONTAIN RISK 7 FACTORS. HE MISUSED THE PHRASE "RISK OF DEATH." 8 THESE RISK ASSESSMENTS DO NOT 9 CALCULATE RISK OF DEATH. THEY CALCULATE RISK OF CANCER, FOR INSTANCE. AND IT'S A WHOLE VARIETY OF 10 TYPES OF CANCERS THAT COULD BE INVOLVED WHICH MAY 11 12 NOT INVOLVE DEATH. I THINK HIS USE OF THAT WORD 13 INDICATES A FRAME OF MIND THAT DID NOT COINCIDE WITH WHAT WE HAD HOPED FOR IN THE TONE OF THIS 14 15 REPORT. CHAIRMAN RELIS: NOW, IF WE WERE TO, 16 17 OUOTE, WORK ON IT, UNQUOTE, WE'RE NOT REALLY A --18 WE'RE NOT AN AIR QUALITY RISK ASSESSMENT BODY HERE, ARE WE? I MEAN DO WE HAVE THE EXPERTISE IN 19 20 STAFF TO EVALUATE THOSE TYPES OF CLAIMS THAT ARE 21 ASSERTIONS MADE HERE? STRONG ASSERTIONS MADE IN 22 REFERENCE TO A NUMBER OF ENVIRONMENTAL 23 ORGANIZATIONS. 24 MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, CAN I JUST 25 MAYBE INTERJECT HERE. WE -- THAT IS NOT AN

- 1 ACTIVITY THAT WE WOULD UNDERTAKE HERE, AND I WOULD JUST LIKE TO POINT OUT, AS I STATED IN MY LETTER 2 3 TO THE CONTRACTOR, REQUESTING HIM TO REMOVE THIS PORTION OF THE REPORT BECAUSE IT WAS NOT CALLED 4 FOR IN THE SCOPE OF WORK, HAD WE ENVISIONED 5 6 UNDERTAKING THIS TYPE OF ACTIVITY, WE WOULD HAVE 7 PUT TOGETHER THE FRAMEWORK FOR REVIEW OF ANY 8 INFORMATION THAT WOULD COME OUT UNDER THIS 9 SECTION. CHAIRMAN RELIS: THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN 10 SOME PEER REVIEW OR SOMETHING? 11 12 MS. TRGOVCICH: EXACTLY. 13 CHAIRMAN RELIS: ALL RIGHT. WELL, I SEE THE PROBLEM MAYBE A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT FROM MR. 14 PENNINGTON, BUT THAT THIS IS A WHOLE BIG SECTION 15 16 IN AN AREA THAT WE NEITHER CALLED FOR, NOR DO WE 17 HAVE THE EXPERTISE TO EVALUATE. THERE'S A LOT OF 18 USEFUL INFORMATION IN THE REPORT, BUT WE HAVE ACCESS TO THAT INFORMATION REGARDLESS OF WHAT WE 19 20 DO. SO... 21 MEMBER PENNINGTON: IF THE CONTRACTOR 22 WANTS TO, AFTER WE REJECT IT, IF HE WANTS TO
- THEN THAT'S FINE. BUT HE'S GIVEN US STUFF AND PUTTING US IN A POSITION THAT WE DIDN'T WANT TO BE

REWRITE IT, PRESENT US WITH WHAT WE ASKED HIM FOR,

1 PUT IN AND WE DIDN'T ASK TO BE PUT IN. 2 CHAIRMAN RELIS: AT LEAST NORMALLY -- AND 3 I'LL CALL ON YOU IN JUST A MOMENT -- MY READING OF 4 MOST STUDIES, IF THERE'S STRONG CLAIMS MADE, EVEN 5 IF THIS IS, SAY, BEYOND THE SCOPE OF WORK, THIS IS 6 NOT THE FOCUS, YOU WOULD HAVE -- YOU WOULD STATE, 7 WELL, THESE ASSERTIONS HAVE BEEN MADE, AND HERE 8 ARE THE FOLLOWING TESTS THAT HAVE BEEN DONE, AND 9 HERE'S THE BODY OF KNOWLEDGE EITHER SUPPORTING, DIFFERING, OR PRESENTING A RANGE OF OPINIONS, 10 SCIENTIFIC VIEWS ON THE SUBJECT. THIS DOES APPEAR 11 FOCUSED ON ONE SIDE OF THAT EQUATION, AND THAT'S 12 13 MY PROBLEM WITH IT. IT'S JUST NOT BALANCED. I MEAN ASSUMING THAT WERE PART OF THE SCOPE OF WORK, 14 I WOULD STILL HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THE 15 16 PRESENTATION. 17 MS. GOTCH. 18 MEMBER GOTCH: MY QUESTION IS WHAT HAPPENS IF WE DO REJECT THIS REPORT? I DON'T KNOW 19 20 IF THAT WAS ANSWERED. 21 MR. CHANDLER: I ATTEMPTED TO ANSWER 22 THAT, WHICH IS IT DOES NOT BECOME A BOARD PRODUCT, 23 DOES NOT CARRY THE BOARD'S PUBLICATION NUMBER, 24 DOES NOT CARRY THE BOARD'S NAME AND LOGO, WOULD

NOT BE A DOCUMENT THAT THIS BOARD HAS ACCEPTED

25

AS

1 A FINAL PRODUCT. IT BECOMES, IF YOU WILL, 2 ABORTED. THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN PRESENTED TO US 3 FOR REVIEW AND WE'RE STOPPING IT HERE, THAT YOU, IN FACT, REJECT THE REPORT AND IT WOULD NOT BECOME 4 5 A PRODUCT OF THIS AGENCY. 6 I WOULD NOT WISH, IN LIGHT OF THE 7 INFORMATION I'VE JUST HEARD ON THIS COPYRIGHT 8 ISSUE, TO SPEND MORE TIME SEEKING A COPYRIGHT 9 ALLOWANCE SO THAT WE CAN THEN TRY TO REPAIR A REPORT THAT FALLS OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF WORK. I'LL 10 11 DIRECT COUNSEL TO THE WILL OF THE COMMITTEE, BUT I 12 THINK THAT'S A PATH TO, IN EFFECT, PATCH UP A 13 DOCUMENT THAT WE FIND CLEARLY OUT OF BALANCE. AND 14 IF IT'S THE WILL OF THE COMMITTEE TO REJECT THE REPORT, I'D JUST AS SOON MOVE ON TO THE OTHER 15 16 IMPORTANT WORK WE HAVE TO DO IN THE DIVISION. 17 MEMBER GOTCH: THANK YOU. 18 MR. CHANDLER: I WILL PURSUE THE REIMBURSEMENT OF THE CONTRACT DOLLARS, THOUGH. 19 I 20 THINK THAT WAS A LEGITIMATE STATEMENT THAT WAS 21 ASKED OF COUNSEL. I DON'T WANT TO SPEND ANY TIME 22 ON THE COPYRIGHT ISSUE. IF YOU'RE SO INCLINED

THE

| 23 | OTHERWISE, | I'LL | DO | SO. | |
|----|------------|------|----|-----|--|
| | | | | | |

- CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. ANY OTHER COMMENTS? I THINK WE'RE --

1 MEMBER PENNINGTON: WANT ME TO RESTATE 2 THE MOTION? 3 CHAIRMAN RELIS: MR. PENNINGTON, WHY 4 DON'T YOU RESTATE THE MOTION? 5 MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'LL MOVE THAT WE 6 REJECT THE REPORT AND THAT WE DIRECT THE LEGAL 7 OFFICE, THE LEGAL STAFF, TO SEEK WHATEVER REMEDIES 8 ARE NECESSARY TO RECAPTURE OUR FUNDS. 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: WOULD THE MAKER OF THAT MOTION, COULD WE BREAK THAT UP --10 11 MEMBER PENNINGTON: SURE. 12 CHAIRMAN RELIS: -- BECAUSE I'M MORE 13 INTERESTED, FRANKLY, LESS CONCERNED ABOUT THE 14 RECAPTURE THAN JUST THE ISSUE OF WHETHER THIS --WE COULD -- ABOUT THE STATUS OF THE REPORT ITSELF. 15 MEMBER PENNINGTON: SURE. I'LL MOVE WE 16 17 REJECT THE REPORT. 18 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I'LL SECOND. CALL THE 19 ROLL. 20 THE SECRETARY: MEMBER GOTCH. 21 MEMBER GOTCH: AYE. 22 THE SECRETARY: MEMBER PENNINGTON. 23 MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE. 24 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN RELIS. 25 CHAIRMAN RELIS: AYE.

1 AND NOW, MR. PENNINGTON, DO YOU WANT 2 TO GO AFTER THE MONEY? 3 MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'LL ALSO MOVE --MAKE A MOTION TO DIRECT LEGAL STAFF TO DETERMINE 4 5 IF WE HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL LEGAL REMEDIES TO 6 RECOVER OUR FUNDS. 7 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SPEAKING TO THE MOTION 8 AGAIN, DO WE -- IS THERE CAUSE HERE TO ACTUALLY 9 RECAPTURE MONEY GIVEN THE FACT THAT THE WORK WAS PERFORMED; AND WHETHER WE AGREE WITH IT OR NOT, 10 11 WHAT'S THE STATUS OF THIS? 12 MR. CHANDLER: OBVIOUSLY, I CAN'T ANSWER 13 THAT RIGHT NOW WITHOUT LOOKING INTO IT. IT'S AN ARGUMENT THAT CAN BE MADE. THE CONTRACT HASN'T 14 FULFILLED THE RESPONSIBILITY. I THINK IN SOME 15 16 RESPECTS IT SEEMS TO HAVE GONE BEYOND WHAT WE 17 ASKED FOR IN THE SCOPE OF WORK, SO WHAT I'D LIKE 18 TO DO IS JUST GET BACK TO YOU ALL THROUGH CORRESPONDENCE ON THE SUCCESS WE'RE GOING TO HAVE 19 20 IN THAT AREA. 21 CHAIRMAN RELIS: DOES THAT MAKE SENSE? 22 MEMBER PENNINGTON: SURE. WE CAN MAKE A 23 MOTION. IF YOU DON'T WANT A MOTION, JUST ASK THEM 24 TO DO IT, THAT'S FINE WITH ME.

CHAIRMAN RELIS: YEAH, AND REPORT BACK TO

1 US. AND SO WE KNOW IF WE'VE GOT AN ISSUE OR NOT. I DON'T FEEL READY TO ACT ON THAT PART. OKAY. 2 3 THANK YOU. 4 MOVING ON, LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS. 5 DO WE WANT THE LAST ITEM ON CONSENT? 6 MEMBER PENNINGTON: I GUESS MY QUESTION 7 IS DOES IT EVEN NEED TO GO TO THE FULL BOARD? 8 WAS A REPORT THAT WAS ASKED FOR BY THIS COMMITTEE. 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: COMMITTEE. JUST TRYING 10 TO REFRESH MY MEMORY ON REPORTS AND THE PROCESS 11 HERE. IT CAN GO ON CONSENT. 12 MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY. FINE. CHAIRMAN RELIS: LET'S PUT IT ON CONSENT. 13 14 MS. RICE: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS, THE 15 NEXT THREE ITEMS ARE INTERRELATED. THE FIRST 16 BEING LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS RELATED TO THE TIRE PROGRAM, THE SECOND BEING POLICY ISSUES RELATED 17 TO 18 REIMBURSEMENT OF LANDOWNERS FOR CLEANUP COSTS, AND 19 THE THIRD BEING THE ALLOCATION ITEM CARRIED OVER 20 FROM THE PRIOR MONTH. IN FACT, ALL THREE ITEMS CARRIED OVER FROM THE PRIOR MONTH. STAFF WOULD 21 BE

SEEKING DIRECTION AT THIS POINT AS TO WHETHER YOU

| 23 | HAVE ANY PREFERENCE | ON THE | ORDER | OF | THE | |
|----|---------------------|---------|-------|-----|-------|--------|
| 24 | PRESENTATION OF THE | ITEMS. | | | | |
| 25 | CHATRMAN RI | TITS: N | T OI | тнт | NK WE | SHOULE |

1 JUST -- WELL, LET'S SEE. I HADN'T THOUGHT ABOUT 2 PULLING THEM OUT OF ORDER. JUST TAKE THEM IN 3 ORDER. 4 MS. RICE: OKAY. THE FIRST ITEM, THEN, IS CONSIDERATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS TO 5 ADDRESS WASTE TIRE MANAGEMENT ISSUES. THESE ARE 6 7 THE SAME OPTIONS WITH, I BELIEVE, A FEW ADDITIONS 8 PULLED FROM THE BOARD'S TIRE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL 9 FOR THIS YEAR. SO THE MAJORITY OF THESE OPTIONS WERE PRINTED IN LAST MONTH'S ITEM AS PART OF THE 10 LARGER ITEM. AND YOU DIRECTED AT LAST MONTH'S 11 COMMITTEE MEETING THAT THEY BE PULLED OUT FOR 12 13 SEPARATE CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS. 14 IF YOU TURN TO PAGE 2 OF THE ITEM, THE LISTING OF OPTIONS BEGINS. AND AGAIN, IF YOU 15 16 WISH, WE COULD GO THROUGH THEM NUMERICALLY AND 17 BRIEFLY DESCRIBE EACH ONE. 18 CHAIRMAN RELIS: WHY DON'T YOU. 19 MS. RICE: OKAY. THE VERY FIRST ONE, 20 THEN, HAS TO DO WITH THE CURRENT LAW PROVISION 21 WHICH CALLS FOR REPEAL OF THIS PROGRAM JANUARY 1 22 OF THE YEAR 2000. SO THE OPTION PRESENTED IN THE 23 ITEM IS TO CHANGE THIS REPEAL DATE IN STATUTE, 24 PRESUMABLY, TO EXTEND THE DATE OUT OR TO ELIMINATE

THE REPEAL. AND I SHOULD ADD PATTY ZWARTS IS HERE

1 FROM THE LEGISLATIVE OFFICE TO ASSIST US WITH THIS 2 ITEM. 3 DO YOU WANT ME TO RUN THROUGH THE 4 FULL LIST? 5 CHAIRMAN RELIS: YES. 6 MS. RICE: THE SECOND ITEM IS 7 CONSIDERATION OF WHETHER YOU WANT TO SEEK 8 LEGISLATION TO INCREASE THE PERCENTAGE AMOUNT, 9 WHAT WE CALL THE ADMINISTRATIVE CAP, FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE TIRE PROGRAM. 10 11 THE CURRENT STATUTORY CAPS ARE 5 PERCENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND 3 PERCENT FOR 12 13 COLLECTION OF THE FEE COSTS, BOE COSTS. THE THIRD IDEA PRESENTED IN THE STAFF REPORT IS TO INCREASE 14 THE AMOUNT OF THE TIRE FEE WHICH CURRENTLY --15 16 CHAIRMAN RELIS: COULD WE GO RIGHT BACK 17 TO THE NO. 2. IN YOUR WRITEUP, YOU'RE SAYING THAT 18 THE LIMITATION OF 5 PERCENT AND THE 3 PERCENT FOR FEE COLLECTION WAS ASSUMING A DOLLAR PER TIRE? 19 20 MS. RICE: RIGHT. MY UNDERSTANDING IS 21 THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CAPS WERE NOT REVISED AS 22 THE LEGISLATION WAS BEING WORKED ON MANY YEARS 23 AGO, WHATEVER YEAR THAT WAS. SO IN OTHER WORDS, 24 THE 5 PERCENT AND THE 3 PERCENT WERE ARRIVED AT IN

THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS WHEN THE FEE WAS SET AT A

1

DOLLAR PER TIRE.

2 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I WASN'T AWARE OF THAT. MS. RICE: WHEN THE FEE WAS LOWERED, THE 3 ADMINISTRATIVE CAPS WERE NOT CORRESPONDINGLY 4 RAISED TO ADDRESS THE FACT THAT THERE IS 5 6 CORRESPONDING LESS MONEY COMING IN, BUT THE 7 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS DIDN'T LESSEN BECAUSE NONE OF 8 THE ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM WERE ELIMINATED, NOR 9 DID THE COST OF BOE COLLECTION OF THE FEE LOWER. CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO THE VIEW IS THAT 10 WE'RE BEING HARMED ADMINISTRATIVELY. WE DON'T 11 HAVE THE BUDGET TO WORK INSIDE ON THIS. 12 13 MS. RICE: RIGHT. AND I BELIEVE IT HAS BEEN ACKNOWLEDGED BY THE CONTROL AGENCY SINCE THE 14 INCEPTION OF THIS PROGRAM THAT WE HAVE BEEN UNABLE 15 16 TO LIVE WITHIN THESE ADMINISTRATIVE CAPS, SO THEY 17 DO NOT, IN FACT, REFLECT WHAT IS NEEDED TO RUN THE 18 PROGRAM ON EITHER END, EITHER BOARD COST OR BOE 19 COST. 20 CHAIRMAN RELIS: WHAT WOULD BE, JUST IF YOU KNOW THIS, WHAT WOULD BE A MORE CHARACTERISTIC 21 22 OR APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF COST THAT STAFF ENVISIONS? 23 MS. RICE: WELL, IT WOULD BE 24 SIGNIFICANTLY MORE. AND IF THE BOARD HAS AN 25 INTEREST IN PURSUING THIS AS A LEGISLATIVE OPTION,

1 WE WOULD DEVELOP THE ACTUAL LANGUAGE, BUT IT WOULD BE SIGNIFICANT, PERHAPS DOUBLE. 2 3 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THAT SEEMS TO HAVE A 4 DIRECT BEARING ALSO ON OUR BUDGET AND OF GREAT 5 CONCERN TO THE BOARD. 6 MS. TRGOVCICH: IT WOULD BE IMPORTANT TO 7 NOTE THAT JUST THE BOE COSTS ALONE NOW EXCEED THE 8 ADMINISTRATIVE CAP THAT WAS PLACED ON THE PROGRAM. 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU. GO ON, 10 PLEASE. 11 MS. RICE: MOVING ALONG, THEN, THE THIRD 12 OPTION LISTED WAS TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF THE TIRE FEE. THIS HAS CERTAINLY BEEN SOMETHING 13 14 THAT'S BEEN DEBATED FOR YEARS, WHETHER THAT'S A 15 GOOD IDEA TO DO. IT'S SUGGESTED IN THE ITEM THAT 16 THE FEE PERHAPS BE RAISED TO A DOLLAR PER TIRE OR 17 IN PARENTHESES MENTION OR ANY AMOUNT CONSIDERED 18 APPROPRIATE BY THE BOARD. 19 THE FOURTH ITEM WAS TO SEEK 20 LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE BOARD TO ACCEPT 21 FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS OTHER THAN THE \$10,000 BOND 22 TO ACCOMPANY APPLICATIONS FOR WASTE TIRE HAULER 23 REGISTRATIONS. THE THOUGHT HERE IS THAT IT MAY BE 2.4 LIMITING TO HAVE JUST THAT ONE OPTION AVAILABLE

AND MAY IMPEDE THE ABILITY OF SOME HAULERS TO

1 BECOME REGISTERED. 2 THE FIFTH ITEM WOULD BE TO SEEK 3 LEGISLATION TO MODIFY THE STATUTORY CRITERIA WHICH CURRENTLY GOVERN OUR GRANTS PROGRAMS AND OUR 5 CONSIDERATION OF THEM. I THINK THIS WAS AN ISSUE 6 RAISED IN THIS LAST GRANT CYCLE WHERE WE FOUND 7 THAT THE ONE SET OF CRITERIA IN THE STATUTE DO NOT 8 NECESSARILY PROVIDE THE FLEXIBILITY TO CONSIDER 9 GRANTS WHICH RANGE FROM CLEANUP TO AMNESTY DAYS TO 10 MARKET DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES. THE DIFFERENT 11 GRANT PROGRAMS HAVE SUCH DIFFERENT OBJECTIVES, AND 12 THE ONE SET OF CRITERIA MAY NOT ENABLE YOU TO 13 JUDGE ALL THOSE DIFFERENT TYPES OF PROGRAMS

16 WISH TO CONSIDER LEGISLATION TO CREATE AN APPEALS

THE SIXTH ITEM LISTED IS

14 SUCCESSFULLY.

15

WHETHER YOU

| 17 | PROCESS FOR WASTE TIRE HAULERS. THERE'S |
|----------|---|
| CURREN | TLY |
| 18 | NOTHING SPECIFIC IN THE LAW, AND WE ARE |
| STARTI | NG |
| 19 | TO ENTER INTO A TIME WHERE THERE MAY BE A |
| REVOKE | 1 |
| 20 | SUSPEND TO ACTIONS RELATED TO TIRE HAULER |
| 21 | REGISTRATIONS. |
| 22 | THE SEVENTH ITEM IS TO MODIFY |
| THE | |
| 23 | APPEALS PROCESS IN STATUTE TO SPECIFICALLY |
| ADDRES | S |
| 24 25 | WASTE TIRE FACILITIES. THERE IS, AGAIN, NO SPECIFIC PROVISION IN THE LAW FOR THAT. KIND |

OF

1 AN APPEALS PROCESS. 2 AND THE LAST ITEM LISTED IS THE 3 CONCEPT OF BANNING THE DISPOSAL OF TIRES IN LANDFILL AS WAS RAISED BY WITNESSES AT THE 4 5 WORKSHOP AND HAS COME UP IN OTHER FORUMS. 6 SO A WIDE RANGE OF IDEAS PRESENTED. 7 FOR CLARIFICATION, A NUMBER OF THESE NOTIONS ARE 8 ALREADY ENCOMPASSED IN THE BOARD'S LEGISLATIVE 9 PROPOSAL FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR, WHICH IS KIND OF PROCEEDING ON ITS OWN TRACK. THAT PROPOSAL WAS 10 11 DEVELOPED WITH THE UNDERSTANDING ON THE PART OF 12 CAL/EPA AND OTHERS THAT ADDITIONAL IDEAS WOULD BE 13 COMING OUT OF YOUR WORK AND WOULD POTENTIALLY BE ADDED TO THAT PROPOSAL. SO THERE IS ALREADY A 14 VEHICLE MOVING THROUGH THE LEGISLATIVE 15 16 CONSIDERATION PROCESS THAT WOULD ENABLE YOU TO ADD 17 ADDITIONAL CONCEPTS TO IT. 18 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. COMMENTS. THIS 19 IS A CONSIDERATION ITEM, SO... 20 MS. RICE: WE WOULD BE SEEKING DIRECTION 21 ON WHETHER YOU WISHED TO INCORPORATE ANY OF THESE 22 IDEAS IN YOUR LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL OR YOU WISH US 23 TO PERHAPS DEVELOP ADDITIONAL WORK ON THEM, SUCH 24 AS DRAFTING THEM, OR POTENTIALLY WISH US TO PURSUE 25 THIS IN ANOTHER MANNER.

- 1 MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IT WOULD SEEM TO ME THAT, NO. 1, THE EXTENSION OF THE 2 3 JANUARY 1, YEAR 2000 FINANCIAL PROVISIONS FOR THE 4 TIRE RECYCLING MANAGEMENT FUND SHOULD BE EXTENDED, 5 THAT THAT SEEMS MORE -- WE'RE ALREADY SPENDING 6 MORE THAN THE CAP. IT WOULD SEEM THAT WOULD BE IN 7 ORDER TO PURSUE THOSE. NO. 4 APPEARS THAT -- I'D LIKE TO 8 9 KNOW MORE ABOUT THAT. MAYBE 6, 7, AND 8 WE NEED TO EXPLORE A LITTLE FURTHER. 10 11 SO MY RECOMMENDATION -- I'M NOT 12 NECESSARILY MAKING A MOTION AT THIS POINT, BUT MY 13 RECOMMENDATION IS THAT WE DO PURSUE 1, 2, AND THEN FLUSH OUT A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT 4, AT LEAST 6, 14 15 7, AND 8. I DON'T KNOW ABOUT 5. I'M NOT SURE 16 ABOUT THAT. 17 MS. RICE: FOR CLARIFICATION, AND I 18 PROBABLY SHOULD HAVE STATED THIS EARLIER, THE ITEMS THAT ARE IN THE BOARD'S PROPOSAL ALREADY 19 20 UNDER CONSIDERATION ARE 1, 5, 6, AND 7. 21 MEMBER PENNINGTON: BOY, I WAS REALLY 22 RIGHT ON POINT, WASN'T I? 23 MS. RICE: PRETTY CLOSE. THEY MUST HAVE
- 24 LOOKED FAMILIAR.
- 25 CHAIRMAN RELIS: MS. GOTCH.

1 MEMBER GOTCH: I'D LIKE TO SEE ALL OF 2 THESE ACTUALLY HAVE SOME WORK DONE ON THEM, AND 3 THEN HAVE THEM GO TO THE LEGISLATION, PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMITTEE. 4 AND YOU HAD OMITTED NO. 3, WHICH IS 5 SOMETHING REFERRED TO IN OUR TIRE WORKSHOP AND 6 7 THROUGHOUT THE STATE, OTHER STATES, THAT WE NEED 8 MORE MONEY IN THE TIRE FUND. AND THIS IS A GOOD 9 WAY TO GO ABOUT THAT. SO... MEMBER PENNINGTON: MAYBE WE SHOULD WAIT 10 11 UNTIL TOMORROW AND DECIDE WHETHER IT'S FEASIBLE OR 12 NOT. 13 MEMBER GOTCH: I'M READY TODAY. CHAIRMAN RELIS: I DON'T MIND REFERRING 14 THAT. I FEEL ACTUALLY A BIT UNCOMFORTABLE DOING 15 THIS IN POLICY COMMITTEE. WE HAVE A NORMAL 16 17 PROCESS, SO I WOULD JUST, WITH THE COMMENTS MADE, 18 SUGGEST WE REFER IT TO LEG. COMMITTEE. MS. RICE: DO YOU WANT AN ACTUAL 19 20 DISCUSSION IN THE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE, MS. 21 GOTCH? I DON'T ORDINARILY. THE PROPOSALS ARE 22 DEALT WITH MORE INFORMALLY RATHER THAN ACTUALLY

HAVING A COMMITTEE AND BOARD DISCUSSION ON THE

MEMBER GOTCH: I GUESS I'M TRYING TO

23

24

25

PROPOSALS.

1 FIGURE OUT WHAT YOU ARE ASKING FOR. 2 MS. RICE: I'M ASKING WHETHER YOU WOULD 3 WISH TO PURSUE THE ORDINARY PROCESS THAT'S PURSUED 4 FOR DEVELOPING LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS. 5 MEMBER GOTCH: ORDINARY PROCESS. THANKS. 6 CHAIRMAN RELIS: ALL RIGHT. WE ARE 7 REFERRING THIS ONE. THERE'S NO VOTE REQUIRED. 8 OKAY. 9 MS. RICE: VERY GOOD. THE ITEM NO. 3 IS 10 CONSIDERATION OF POLICY OPTIONS CONCERNING 11 REIMBURSEMENT OF PROPERTY OWNERS FOR TIRE PILE 12 CLEANUP COSTS. AGAIN, THIS IS A POLICY ISSUE THAT YOU HEARD BRIEFLY AT LAST MONTH'S COMMITTEE 13 14 MEETING AND DIRECTED THAT STAFF BRING IT BACK TO 15 THIS MONTH'S MEETING. AND THIS IS CONSIDERATION 16 OF WHETHER THE COMMITTEE WANTS TO ESTABLISH A 17 POLICY AS TO WHETHER THE STATE SHOULD REIMBURSE 18 PROPERTY OWNERS WHO UNDERTAKE CLEANUP OF SITES 19 WHICH POSE A SIGNIFICANT THREAT WHO DID NOT CAUSE 20 OR CONTRIBUTE TO THE WASTE TIRE PILE. AND A 21 NUMBER OF OTHER QUALIFIERS ARE DESCRIBED AS 22 POTENTIAL AREAS FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION IN THE 23 ITEM. STAFF IS PRESENTING THIS WITHOUT 24 RECOMMENDATION.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY.

1 CHAIRMAN RELIS: MR. PENNINGTON, DID YOU 2 WANT TO SPEAK? 3 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YES, I WOULD. 4 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE DOES NOT PROHIBIT, NOR DOES 5 IT SPECIFICALLY ALLOW REIMBURSEMENT TO A LANDOWNER 6 WHO HAS CLEARED UP WASTE TIRES ON HIS LAND WHERE 7 HE HAD NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR PLACING THE TIRES ON 8 THE LAND. I'D LIKE TO SEE LEGAL STAFF TO PREPARE 9 AN ANALYSIS ON WHETHER OR NOT THIS AUTHORITY IS IMPLIED IN THE PRC OR THAT WE NEED LEGISLATION 10 11 CLARIFYING IT. 12 IF THE AUTHORITY IS IMPLIED, I WOULD 13 LIKE LEGAL STAFF TO PREPARE A POLICY FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMITTEE AT OUR JANUARY 14 MEETING ON REIMBURSEMENTS OF INNOCENT LANDOWNERS. 15 16 THE POLICY SHOULD CONSIDER A REASONABLE MAN 17 STANDARD. DID THE LANDOWNER KNOW OR SHOULD THE 18 LANDOWNER HAVE KNOWN THAT THE TIRES WERE BEING 19 DEPOSITED ON HIS LAND? HAS THE LANDOWNER TAKEN 20 ALL FEASIBLE ACTION TO RECOVER HIS CLEANUP COSTS 21 TO THE RESPONSIBLE PARTIES? IF THE BOARD HAS 22 TAKEN ACTION AGAINST THE REASONABLE PARTY, CAN THE 23 BOARD TRANSFER THE COLLECTION OF AND FINES OR 24 LIENS TO THE INNOCENT LANDOWNER? HOW SHOULD 25 REIMBURSEMENT BE CONSIDERED IN TERMS OF OUR

1 PRIORITIZATION ON SITES? FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE SITE IS TWELFTH 2 3 ON OUR LIST, SHOULD REIMBURSEMENT WAIT UNTIL REACHING NO. 12? SHOULD A PERCENTAGE LIMIT BE PUT 4 5 ON OUR TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE TO BE USED FOR 6 REIMBURSEMENT, REVIEW LOCAL ORDINANCES TO SEE IF 7 THERE ARE SIMILAR PROVISIONS FOR INNOCENT LANDOWNERS. ESTIMATE THE COST OF DETERMINING AN 8 9 INNOCENT LANDOWNER TO EXISTING BOARD RESOURCES. I'D BE HAPPY TO MAKE THAT AVAILABLE TO STAFF SO 10 11 THEY COULD FOLLOW THIS. 12 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO IF I COULD SURMISE, 13 YOU FEEL THIS NEEDS QUITE A BIT MORE WORK TO CLARIFY WHERE THE CIRCUMSTANCES, IF WE WERE TO 14 ADOPT A POLICY, SPECIFICALLY UNDER WHICH 15 16 ALLOCATION IT COULD BE MADE. 17 MEMBER PENNINGTON: FIRST, I THINK WE 18 NEED TO DETERMINE WHETHER WE REALLY HAVE THE AUTHORITY AND WHETHER IT'S IMPLIED AND WHAT IS IN 19 20 THE PRC, OR WHETHER OR NOT. I KNOW THAT MR. 21 DILLINGHAM'S ATTORNEY HAS MADE SOME VERY VALID 22 POINTS ABOUT WHAT IS IN THE LAW AND WHAT CAN BE 23 DONE. AND I KNOW OUR LEGAL OFFICE HAS LOOKED AT 24 IT SUBSTANTIALLY, BUT I'D LIKE TO CLARIFY THAT. 25 SECOND, IT MAY BE THAT THIS IS AN

- 1 ISSUE THAT WE SHOULD SEEK LEGISLATIVE 2 CLARIFICATION ON, SO I'D LIKE FOR THE LEGAL STAFF 3 TO LOOK AT THAT. IF WE HAVE THE -- IF IT'S DETERMINED THAT WE HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH 4 5 SUCH A POLICY, THEN I WOULD LIKE THEM TO LOOK AT 6 THESE SEVERAL ITEMS AND PREPARE THE POLICY BASED 7 UPON THAT SORT OF A FRAMEWORK, IF THAT'S 8 ACCEPTABLE TO THE COMMITTEE. IF YOU NEED, I'LL 9 CERTAINLY MOVE THAT, OR WE CAN JUST ASK THAT IT'S 10 DONE. CHAIRMAN RELIS: WELL, WE COULD -- DO WE 11 12 NEED A MOTION? WE COULD JUST DIRECT STAFF TO DO 13 FURTHER WORK ON THIS. WE'RE NOT PREPARED, AS I READ IT, TO NECESSARILY MAKE A FORMAL MOTION. WE 14 15 WANT TO LOOK AT IT AS A, FIRST, LEGAL ANALYSIS AND 16 THE OTHER POINTS THAT MR. PENNINGTON HAD MADE 17 BECAUSE IT MIGHT REQUIRE LEGISLATION. MR. CHANDLER: I THINK YOUR DIRECTION 18 IS CLEAR, AND WE GET COPIES OF MR. PENNINGTON'S 19 20 DIRECTION. WE CAN PURSUE THAT DIRECTION AND
- 21 BACK TO YOU WITH A REPORT.

COME

22 CHAIRMAN RELIS: ALL RIGHT. NOW, I

HAVE

- 23 A REQUEST FROM JOHN LORMON TO SPEAK TO THIS ITEM.
- MR. LORMON: MORNING, MR. CHAIR AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. I WON'T TAKE BUT A MINUTE.

1 I JUST WANTED TO UNDERSTAND THE PROCEDURE, I 2 GUESS, IN PART AND THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO ME. 3 WOULD IT BE PERMISSIBLE FOR ME TO CONTACT MS. TOBIAS AND TO GET INPUT TO HER ABOUT 4 5 THE COMMENTS THAT YOU MADE TODAY, MR. PENNINGTON? 6 MEMBER PENNINGTON: CERTAINLY. 7 MR. LORMON: I DO HAVE SOME. AND I GUESS 8 ON TIMING, I UNDERSTAND IT WILL COME BACK IN 9 JANUARY, SO I SHOULD GET BACK WITH HER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AND I WILL DO THAT. I DO THINK -- I DID 10 SUBMIT A LETTER THAT UNFORTUNATELY ARRIVED TODAY. 11 I THOUGHT THE HEARING WAS LATER IN THE MONTH. 12 13 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I'VE NOT RECEIVED THAT. MR. LORMON: IT WAS MY MISTAKE. I 14 THOUGHT THIS COMMITTEE MET JUST PRIOR TO THE BOARD 15 16 MEETING, NOT SEVERAL WEEKS BEFORE BECAUSE THAT WAS 17 MY EXPERIENCE IN SEPTEMBER. 18 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I DID ACKNOWLEDGE, BUT I HAVE NOT HAD TIME TO READ IT. 19 20 MR. LORMON: I CAN UNDERSTAND THAT. SO I 21 DO WANT TO JUST ENTER THAT IN THE RECORD IF YOU 22 COULD, ALTHOUGH THERE WAS ONE TYPO IN IT BECAUSE I 23 WAS KIND OF RUSHED. I MAY SUPPLEMENT IT, AND I'LL

GET WITH LEGAL COUNSEL TO DISCUSS THAT.

WE DO FEEL THERE'S IMPLIED AUTHORITY

24

- 1 AND IT ISN'T NECESSARY FOR A LEGISLATIVE ROUTE,
- 2 THAT TIME INVOLVED IN THAT WOULD BE VERY
- 3 UNFAVORABLE, IN OUR PARTICULAR CASE AT LEAST AND I
- 4 THINK FOR THE BENEFITS OF THE POLICY. SO
- 5 HOPEFULLY LEGAL STAFF WILL COME BACK WITH THAT
- 6 SAME POSITION.
- 7 ONE LAST QUESTION. IF THE LEGAL
- 8 STAFF COMES BACK AND CONCLUDES THAT THE AUTHORITY
- 9 IS NOT IMPLIED, WHAT THEN WILL -- WILL THERE BE AN
- 10 OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO COME BACK IN FRONT OF THIS
- 11 COMMITTEE OR ARE --
- 12 CHAIRMAN RELIS: WE WOULD HAVE A REPORT
- BACK, SINCE IT'S BEEN DIRECTED TO STAFF TO COME
- 14 BACK AND REPORT TO THIS COMMITTEE, AND AT THAT
- 15 TIME, IF IT'S -- ASSUMING IT'S A NOTICED ITEM,
- 16 WHICH -- OR IT WOULD BE THE DIRECTOR'S REPORT.
- 17 I'M NOT QUITE SURE WHAT FORMAT. COULD WE MAKE
- 18 SURE THAT MR. LORMON IS NOTIFIED THAT HIS ITEM

OF

- 19 INTEREST WILL AT LEAST BE DISCUSSED?
- 20 MR. CHANDLER: TO TAKE HIS

HYPOTHETICAL,

- 21 IF YOU WILL, IF THE RESULTS OF THE LEGAL ANALYSIS
- 22 IS SUCH THAT THERE'S THE CONCLUSION ON OUR

STAFF'S

| 23 | PART THAT THERE'S NO IMPLIED AUTHORITY, YOU CAN |
|----------|---|
| | REST ASSURED WE'LL MAKE THAT ANALYSIS WITH A |
| 25 TO | FOUNDATION TO COME TO THAT CONCLUSION AVAILABLE |

- 1 YOUR OFFICES. AND I WOULD ASSUME FROM THAT YOU
- 2 WILL WANT TO RESPOND AND THE BOARD CAN HAVE, IF
- 3 YOU WILL, REBUTTAL OR YOUR TAKE ON THAT ANALYSIS
- 4 AS THEY REVIEW OUR RECOMMENDATIONS. AGAIN, THAT'S
- 5 ASSUMING THAT WE CONCLUDE THERE'S NO IMPLIED
- 6 AUTHORITY.
- 7 MR. LORMON: WHICH I HOPE YOU DO, BUT IF
- 8 YOU DO, SO THERE'D BE AN OPPORTUNITY TO REPLY AND
- 9 THEN, HOPEFULLY, COME BACK TO THE COMMITTEE AND
- 10 MAKE OUR CASE.
- 11 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU, MR. LORMON.
- 12 OKAY.
- THAT BRINGS US TO ITEM 4, THE MAIN
- 14 EVENT FOR TODAY. AND BEFORE WE LAUNCH INTO THIS,
- 15 I'D LIKE TO MAKE A FEW REMARKS. JUST TO FRAME THE
- 16 SITUATION, WE HAD RECOMMENDATIONS PRESENTED BY
- 17 POLICY -- PRESENTED AT POLICY COMMITTEE LAST
- 18 MONTH, AND THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE ON ONE TO
- 19 THREE OF THE AGENDA ITEM. THEY INCLUDE A
- 20 LONG-TERM POLICY STATEMENT AND OBJECTIVES
- 21 REGARDING THE WASTE TIRES, AND THAT'S WHERE WE
- 22 DISCUSSED AMONG THOSE OBJECTIVES TRYING TO

BALANCE

- 23 THE CLEANUP AND MARKET FUNCTIONS.
- TO DIRECT US, WE DIRECTED A
- 25 SPLIT-OUT OF THE PROPERTY OWNER REIMBURSEMENT

1 ISSUE AND THE LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS, WHICH WE TOOK 2 UP UNDER ITEM 2 TODAY. AND WE HAD A SPECIFIC 3 RECOMMENDATION ON FUNDING SUMMARIZED ON TABLE 1 OF 4 PAGE 3 OF THE AGENDA ITEM. 5 \$864,000 WERE NOT ALLOCATED AT THAT 6 TIME, AND THE FULL BOARD REFERRED THIS BACK TO 7 TODAY'S MEETING FOR CONSIDERATION. SO WE'VE SPENT 8 ABOUT A MONTH IN COMMITTEE, AND WE'VE SPENT TIME AT THE BOARD AND WAS DECIDED MORE WORK WAS NEEDED, SO IT WAS SENT BACK TO THIS COMMITTEE. 10 11 SINCE THEN STAFF FROM THE BOARD 12 OFFICES HAVE DISCUSSED IDEAS ON FUNDING. MR. 13 CHANDLER AND OTHER STAFF HAVE MET WITH THE 14 CALIFORNIA POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCE AUTHORITY --NEVER SURE I GET THAT RIGHT -- BUT TO BEGIN 15 DISCUSSIONS REGARDING THE LONG-TERM STATUS OF THE 16 17 MELP OPERATION THERE. 18 BEFORE WE CONSIDER FINAL 19 RECOMMENDATIONS ON FUNDING, I WOULD ASK THAT WE 20 HEAR BRIEFLY FROM MR. CHANDLER ON HIS MEETING WITH

CPCFA AND THEN FROM STAFF ON ANY IDEAS, CONCERNS,

| OR QUESTIONS ABOUT VARIOUS FUNDING PROPOSALS THAT |
|---|
| ARE BEFORE US. |
| MR. CHANDLER: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. |
| AS YOU ASKED AT THE OCTOBER BOARD MEETING ON |
| |

OCTOBER 31ST, JUST LAST THURSDAY, I DID CONVENE A

1

2 MEETING IN MY OFFICES WITH MR. KEITH SEEGMILLER, 3 CPCFA, POLLUTION FINANCING AUTHORITY, JUST TO 4 EXPLORE THEIR PAST ROLE AND THEIR PERSPECTIVE, IF 5 YOU WILL, ON THE WHOLE FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OUT 6 THERE. 7 AS YOU KNOW, THE BOARD'S PAST FOCUS HAS REALLY BEEN ON THE TIRE PILE ITSELF, AND THAT 8 WAS THE SUBJECT OF A PERMIT PASSED EARLIER THIS 9 10 APRIL WITH SPECIFIC TIME LINES ON HOW WE WOULD SEE THAT TIRE PILE AND REMEDIATE IT. 11 12 THAT TIME LINE CALLS FOR A FOUR-YEAR 13 HORIZON TO COMPLETELY ELIMINATE THE PILE, YET ${\tt WE}$ RECOGNIZE THAT WITH THE WHOLE UTILITY 14 15 RESTRUCTURING THAT'S GOING ON IN THIS STATE, THAT 16 JUST LESS THAN REALLY ONE YEAR FROM NOW, THAT 17 ENERGY FACILITY, THE MODESTO ENERGY FACILITY, IS FACING ITS WHAT IS REFERRED TO AS ITS CLIFF 18 DATE 19 FOR RENEGOTIATION OF ITS ENERGY AND SUPPLY

20 AND PRICES. 21 I EXPLORED WITH MR. SEEGMILLER THE 22 AUTHORITIES EXPERIENCED ON OTHER DISTRESSED 23 COGENERATION OR ENERGY FACILITIES, AND HE POINTED 24 OUT A NUMBER OF INSTANCES WHERE THEY HAD 25 SUCCESSFULLY RENEGOTIATED THE INDEBTEDNESS THAT

1 OCCURS AT SOME OF THESE COGENERATION PLANTS IN LIGHT OF THE RESTRUCTURING AND FELT THAT THE 2 3 POLICY QUESTION REALLY BEFORE THIS BOARD IS 4 WHETHER WE SAW THAT FACILITY OUT THERE, REFERRING 5 TO THE ENERGY PLANT NOW, AS SOMETHING THAT WE 6 WANTED TO SEE AS AN ONGOING MARKET FOR WASTE TIRES 7 IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY. 8 AND IT'S BEEN MY BELIEF THAT THIS BOARD HAS RECOGNIZED THE ROLE THAT THAT FACILITY 9 10 HAS PLAYED INASMUCH AS, IF MY NUMBERS ARE RIGHT --11 CAREN, CORRECT ME -- SEVEN TO EIGHT MILLION TIRES 12 ANNUALLY WOULD GO TO THAT FACILITY OR HAVE GONE TO THAT FACILITY ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, WHICH IS ABOUT 13 14 EQUAL TO WHAT WE SEE RIGHT NOW GOING TO THE CEMENT 15 INDUSTRY ON A STATEWIDE BASIS. I WOULD JUST SAY, IN GENERAL, I WAS 16 17 VERY ENCOURAGED BY THE MEETING FROM THE STANDPOINT 18 THAT I THINK WE HAVE SOME OPPORTUNITIES TO LOOK IN A BROADER WAY THAN MAYBE WE'VE LOOKED IN THE PAST 19 20 AND LOOK AT THE SHORT-TERM AND PERHAPS LONGER-TERM 21 VIABILITY OF THAT FACILITY WITH US TRYING TO TAKE 22 A LEADERSHIP POSITION, ALONG WITH CPCFA, TO SEE IF 23 THERE'S SOME RESTRUCTURING THAT COULD OCCUR IN THE 2.4 OVERALL INDEBTEDNESS OF THE FACILITY THAT WOULD MAKE IT A LONG-TERM, VIABLE ASSET TO CONTINUE TO

1 BE A HOME FOR WASTE TIRES IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY. 2 I THINK THAT'S GOING TO TAKE SOME 3 NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE BANKS, SOME NEGOTIATIONS OBVIOUSLY WITH MELP, AND POTENTIALLY EVEN OXFORD, 4 THE FUEL SUPPLIER AT THIS TIME, AND CERTAINLY I 5 THINK THIS BOARD HAS A VESTED INTEREST TO STAY AT 6 7 THE TABLE AND HELP FACILITATE THOSE MEETINGS. 8 I WOULD ENCOURAGE ALL OF YOU, EITHER 9 INDIVIDUALLY OR COLLECTIVELY, TO HAVE CONVERSATIONS WITH MR. SEEGMILLER. HE MADE 10 HIMSELF AVAILABLE TO DO THAT SO YOU CAN LEARN 11 THEIR EXPERIENCE ON SOME OF THESE OTHER 12 13 RESTRUCTURING SITUATIONS THEY'VE ENCOUNTERED. 14 MY RECOMMENDATION TO THIS COMMITTEE IS THAT YOU CONTINUE TO RECOGNIZE THE CATEGORY 15 16 THAT WE IDENTIFIED AS PRIORITY SITES AND SET ASIDE 17 SOME LEVEL OF FUNDING THAT WOULD KEEP THIS AT THE 18 TABLE AND NEGOTIATIONS TO ADDRESS WHAT I CONSIDER AS AN ASSET FOR THE STATE AND TO RECEIVING WASTE 19 20 TIRES IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY. THE FIGURE THAT 21 STAFF HAVE RECOMMENDED, AT LEAST FOR THE REMAINING 22 PART OF THIS YEAR, IS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF ABOUT 23 \$500,000 FOR PRIORITY SITES. 24 SO I WOULD JUST WANT TO SAY AGAIN 25 THAT I FELT THE MEETING WAS A POSITIVE ONE, AND

1 ONE WHICH WE'D LIKE TO CONTINUE TO NEGOTIATE WITH 2 THE PLAYERS INVOLVED AND LEAVE IT AS A POLICY 3 QUESTION FOR THIS COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE WHAT 4 APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT MIGHT BE 5 AVAILABLE FOR THOSE TYPES OF PRIORITY SITES AROUND 6 THE STATE. 7 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU. I WANT TO 8 THANK YOU, MR. CHANDLER, FOR GETTING RIGHT ON THIS 9 AND MEETING WITH CPCFA RIGHT AWAY BECAUSE IT'S A PRIORITY CONCERN OF OURS, AND WE NEED TO KNOW WHAT 10 11 THEIR TAKE IS ON IT. MR. SEEGMILLER IS EXTREMELY 12 KNOWLEDGEABLE ON THESE MATTERS. WE'VE DEALT WITH 13 HIM AND CPCFA IN A NUMBER OF VENUES. SO THANK 14 YOU. BEFORE WE TAKE UP THAT ISSUE 15 SPECIFICALLY, I'D ASK STAFF IF THERE WERE ANY 16 17 OTHER COMMENTS, CONCERNS, OR QUESTIONS ABOUT 18 VARIOUS FUNDING PROPOSALS. AND THEN THERE ARE A NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE ASKED TO APPEAR ON THIS 19 20 ITEM; AND IF YOU DON'T HAVE ANYTHING, THEN I'LL 21 MOVE TO ANY TESTIMONY. 22 MS. RICE: I DON'T BELIEVE WE HAVE ANY 23 SPECIFIC QUESTIONS. AS YOU GO THROUGH WHAT YOUR 24 RECOMMENDATIONS MAY BE, WE MAY CERTAINLY HAVE

25

QUESTIONS AT THAT TIME.

```
1
               CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO YOU WILL RESERVE YOUR
 2
      OPTION. OKAY.
 3
                    THEN LET'S GO TO THE PUBLIC
      TESTIMONY. I'LL FIRST CALL ON ED TOMEO WITH
 4
      MODESTO ENERGY. AND AGAIN, OUR MODE WILL BE,
 5
 6
      REMEMBER, WE'RE NARROWING OUR FRAMEWORK HERE
 7
      TODAY. WE'VE ALREADY HAD ONE HEARING ON THIS
      MATTER. IF IT'S STRICTLY A REHASH OF WHAT WE'VE
 8
 9
      HEARD ALREADY, THEN KEEP IT VERY BRIEF. IF IT'S
      NEW MATERIAL, THEN YOU'VE GOT UP TO FIVE MINUTES.
10
11
               MR. TOMEO: I DON'T BELIEVE I'LL NEED
      FIVE MINUTES. I JUST DO WISH TO CONTINUE TO
12
13
      EXPRESS OUR SUPPORT FOR WORKING WITH THE BOARD IN
      CLEANING UP THE WESTLEY TIRE PILE, AND THAT THE
14
      MEETING WITH MR. SEEGMILLER IS IMPORTANT TO US AS
15
16
      WELL. AS WE HAVE RECOUNTED TO YOU BEFORE, OUR
17
      JOB, UA ENERGY OPERATIONS CORP., THAT IS, IS
18
      BASICALLY WORKING TO SECURE AS MUCH MONEY AS
      POSSIBLE TO PAY A PORTION OF THE DEBT ON THIS
19
20
      PROJECT. AND ALTHOUGH WE DO CONSIDER MORE OFTEN
21
      THAN NOT THAT WE ARE WORKING FOR THE BANKS IN THIS
22
      REGARD, THE BANKS ACTUALLY HAVE A LETTER OF CREDIT
23
      THAT BACKSTOPS OR SUPPORTS CALIFORNIA FINANCING.
24
      AND SO IT IS IMPORTANT TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
```

TO KEEP THESE BONDS HEALTHY.

1 MR. SEEGMILLER IN CONVERSATIONS WITH 2 US HAS EXPRESSED THAT CONTINUED AMBITION. AND I 3 BELIEVE WE HAVE THE ABILITY, BOTH HERE WITH REGARD TO PAYMENTS THAT COULD BE RECEIVED ON THE TIRE 4 5 SIDE, AS WELL AS THE OTHER OPTIONS THAT WE 6 CONTINUE TO EXPLORE, WHICH ARE PAYMENTS ON THE 7 ELECTRIC SIDE, TO COME UP WITH A SOLUTION THAT 8 KEEPS THE BONDS IN PLACE AND RETAINS THIS 9 IMPORTANT FACILITY FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU. SAM BARBER, 10 11 THE COGENERATION ASH COALITION. 12 MR. BARBER: GOOD MORNING. PLEASURE TO 13 BE ABLE TO SPEAK TO YOU AGAIN AND ADDRESS YOU. I WILL ALSO TRY TO KEEP MY REMARK VERY BRIEF. AND 14 AS A COALITION, I REPRESENT A NUMBER OF COAL-FIRED 15 16 POWER GENERATING FACILITIES IN CALIFORNIA. 17 WE ARE HIGHLY INTERESTED IN PURSUING 18 USING TIRES AS A SUPPLEMENTAL FUEL, PROBABLY 20 TO 30 PERCENT. AT THIS RATE WE ESTIMATE WE COULD 19 20 BURN BETWEEN SIX AND SEVEN MILLION TIRES A YEAR. AT THE PREVIOUS HEARING, WE DID HEAR SOMEONE 21 THAT 22 SUGGESTED THAT THE FUNDS FOR COGENERATION AND THE 23 CEMENT INDUSTRIES BE COMMINGLED INTO ONE.

| 24 | BELIEVE | THAT'S | NOT | A WISE | E MOVI | Ξ. | | | |
|----|---------|--------|------|--------|--------|---------|----|-----|--|
| 25 | | 7 | WE B | ELIEVE | THAT | BECAUSE | OF | THE | |

1 DIFFERENT CONDITIONS IN OUR COMBUSTION 2 TEMPERATURES AND THE WHOLE PROCESS AND AGAINST THE CEMENT INDUSTRY, THAT WE SHOULD BE KEPT 3 SEPARATE. 4 THERE ARE A NUMBER OF DEFINITE DIFFERENCES IN THE 5 TECHNOLOGIES AND THE METHODS THE TIRES WOULD BE 6 USED. 7 SO WE WOULD CERTAINLY ASK THE BOARD 8 TO MAINTAIN THESE TWO AS SEPARATE ITEMS. AND WE 9 BELIEVE AT THE MOMENT THAT THE 200,000 WHICH WAS IN THE INITIAL PROPOSAL IS AN APPROPRIATE AMOUNT 10 FOR INITIAL TESTING AND FOR US TO GET SOME IDEA 11 OF 12 WHAT WE CAN DO HERE. SO WE DO SUPPORT THE BOARD 13 IN THIS, AND WE'RE CERTAINLY WILLING AND LOOKING FORWARD TO WORKING WITH YOU IN THE FUTURE TO 14 15 EXAMINE IF THIS IS A POSSIBILITY. THANK YOU. 16 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU. ANY 17 OUESTIONS? MICHAEL HARRINGTON REPRESENTING BAS 18 RECYCLING. 19 MR. HARRINGTON: GOOD MORNING. I'D

LIKE

| 20 | 10 FIND OUI, WOOLD II BE POSSIBLE 10 FIND OUI |
|--------------------|--|
| WHAT | |
| 21 | THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON MARKET |
| 22 | DEVELOPMENT, IF ANY, ARE GOING TO BE, AND THEN |
| 23 | HAVE MY REMARKS AFTER THAT? IS THE BOARD |
| LOOKIN | g |
| 24 25 BELIEV | CHAIRMAN RELIS: YES, WE ARE. I |

1 IT'S STATED IN THE REPORT. 2 MS. RICE: WHAT IS STATED IN THE REPORT 3 IS THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE PRIOR MEETING. ANY EVOLUTION FROM THAT POINT HAS NOT 4 5 YET BEEN PUBLICLY DISCUSSED. 6 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. MR. CHANDLER: THAT CAN BE FOUND ON PAGE 7 8 51. 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: DO YOU HAVE 51? MR. HARRINGTON: I DON'T. WOULD IT BE 10 APPROPRIATE TO SPEAK TO IT NOW OR --11 CHAIRMAN RELIS: WELL, WE'RE TRYING TO 12 13 DEAL WITH THE PUBLIC TESTIMONY. OTHERWISE THE BOARD GOES INTO A DELIBERATION AFTER WE HEAR 14 TESTIMONY, AND THEN WE NORMALLY PROCEED TO VOTE ON 15 16 ITEMS. SO I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT IF YOU ARE GOING 17 TO SAY SOMETHING ON MARKET DEVELOPMENT, YOU DO IT 18 NOW; AND IF WE CAN QUICKLY GET A COPY OF THE 19 FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS BEFORE --20 MS. TRGOVCICH: WE CAN MAYBE JUST --21 CHAIRMAN RELIS: DO YOU WANT -- MAYBE 22 WHAT I WOULD DO, OUT OF COURTESY TO YOU, IS CALL 23 ON WHOEVER ELSE WISHES TO SPEAK SO YOU HAVE A

MOMENT TO LOOK AT THAT. WOULD YOU WANT TO DO

THAT, MR. HARRINGTON? OR DO YOU WANT TO STAY

24

1 WHERE YOU ARE? 2 MR. HARRINGTON: I WAS UNDER THE 3 IMPRESSION THAT WITH MARKET DEVELOPMENT THERE MIGHT BE SOMETHING TO LOOK TO A STIMULATION TO A 4 PLAYGROUND RESILIENT SURFACING. AND THAT IS WHAT 5 6 I WANTED TO SPEAK TO. IF YOU -- IF IT WOULD BE 7 NOW OR LATER, I'LL DO IT EITHER TIME. 8 CHAIRMAN RELIS: WELL, IF YOU WANT TO BE 9 SPECIFIC AND YOU'RE CLEAR ABOUT WHAT YOU WANT TO SAY, GO AHEAD AND SAY IT NOW. 10 11 MR. HARRINGTON: INCUMBENT ON THE BOARD IS A REQUIREMENT TO FOLLOW NOT ONLY THE LETTER OF 12 13 THE TIRE RECYCLING ACT, AB 1843, THE FUNDING SOURCE FOR THE TIRE FUND, BUT ALSO FOLLOW THE 14 15 INTENT OF THE LEGISLATION. ACCORDINGLY, WE BELIEVE GRANT FUNDING SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO 16 17 THOSE LEGITIMATE REQUESTS THAT SPECIFICALLY EXPAND 18 TIRE RECYCLING BY INCREASING MARKETS AND/OR RECYCLING CAPACITY TO THOSE APPLICANTS THAT 19 20 PROVIDE A DEMONSTRATED CAPABILITY TO ACHIEVE GRANT 21 GOALS. 22 WITH THAT PREFACE, WE REQUEST THE 23 COMMITTEE RECOMMEND A MULTI-YEAR 250 TO \$300,000 24 IN GRANT FUNDING BE MADE AVAILABLE AS 50-PERCENT 25 MATCHING FUNDS TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS THROUGHOUT

1 THE STATE. THE MATCHING FUNDS WOULD BE USED FOR 2 THE SCHOOLS TO PURCHASE IMPACT ATTENUATION 3 SURFACING OR PLAYGROUND MATS THAT WOULD, A, MEET THE CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION'S MINIMUM 4 5 STANDARDS AS SET FORTH IN ASTM STANDARD F1292-93 6 FOR IMPACT ATTENUATION TO THE MAXIMUM DROP HEIGHT 7 UNDER AND AROUND PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT; B, MEET THE 8 REQUIREMENTS OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT FOR ACCESS TO PLAY EQUIPMENT FOR THE 9 MOBILITY IMPAIRED; C, BE MANUFACTURED USING 100 PERCENT 10 11 CRUMB RUBBER FROM WHOLE TIRE RECYCLING, 12 ELIMINATING ANY OTHER SCRAP RUBBER SOURCES; AND, 13 D, REQUIRE THE WHOLE TIRE RECYCLED CRUMB RUBBER BE14 DERIVED FROM THE RECYCLING OF TIRES GENERATED IN 15 CALIFORNIA. 16 FUNDING THIS REQUEST WOULD PROVIDE 17 MANY TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE BENEFITS, INCLUDING, A, ASSIST SCHOOL DISTRICTS THROUGHOUT THE STATE 18 ΙN 19 MEETING RECOMMENDED MINIMUM SAFETY STANDARDS AS

SET FORTH BY A CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY

COMMISSION;

| 21 | B, SHOWCASE A SUCCESSFUL GRANT AWARD; C, PROVIDE |
|-------------------|---|
| 22 | PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE BOARD'S FUNCTIONS AND |
| 23 | COMMITMENT TO WASTE REDUCTION THROUGH RECYCLING; |
| 24 25 CRUMB | AND, D, PROVIDE MARKETPLACE AWARENESS TO A NEW PRODUCT AND ASSIST IN MARKET DEVELOPMENT FOR |

1 RUBBER FROM WHOLE TIRE RECYCLING. 2 THANK YOU. I HAVE SOME SAMPLES 3 IF --CHAIRMAN RELIS: IS THIS YOURS? 4 MR. HARRINGTON: YES. IF YOU'D LIKE TO 5 6 SEE A QUICK SAMPLE OF THE MATS THAT WE'RE 7 CURRENTLY PRODUCING, EVEN THE COLORED PORTION IS 8 WHOLE TIRE RECYCLED RUBBER. WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO 9 COME UP WITH A RESIN TREATMENT THAT COLORS THEM. AND THE ONE THAT YOU HAVE, MR. CHAIRMAN RELIS, 10 11 MEETS A DROP HEIGHT OF 6 FEET. THE LARGE TILE OVER HERE, TWO FOOT BY TWO FOOT, MEETS THE 12 13 RECOMMENDED STANDARD FROM A NINE-FOOT DROP HEIGHT. 14 IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, I'D BE MORE THAN HAPPY TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT THEM. 15 16 CHAIRMAN RELIS: QUESTIONS? MS. GOTCH. 17 MEMBER GOTCH: MR. HARRINGTON, DO YOU 18 HAVE AN ESTIMATE OF HOW MANY TIRES MIGHT BE USED 19 FOR THIS PROJECT? 20 MR. HARRINGTON: YES. FOR EACH TWO-FOOT 21 BY TWO-FOOT TILE REQUIRES A RECYCLING OF THREE 22 TIRES TO DERIVE THE CRUMB RUBBER NECESSARY TO 23 MANUFACTURE THE TILE. 24 MEMBER GOTCH: OKAY. AND THERE ARE TENS

OF THOUSANDS OF PLAYGROUNDS IN THE STATE.

1 HAVE AN ESTIMATE OF HOW MANY TIRES MIGHT BE USED? I GUESS I'M ALSO, AS THE OTHER BOARD MEMBERS KNOW, 2 3 INTERESTED IN NOT JUST SCHOOL PLAYGROUNDS, BUT LOCAL GOVERNMENT MATCHING GRANTS ALSO FOR 4 PLAYGROUNDS BECAUSE THERE ARE A NUMBER OF 5 6 PLAYGROUNDS THROUGHOUT THE STATE. 7 MR. HARRINGTON: THERE ARE A NUMBER OF 8 PLAYGROUNDS. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF PLAYGROUNDS 9 THAT ARE OUT OF COMPLIANCE WITH CURRENT RECOMMENDED STANDARDS. AND I BELIEVE THERE'S 10 STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRING THAT ALL NEW 11 PLAYGROUNDS OR REMODELED PLAYGROUNDS MEET THE 12 13 MINIMUM CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION STANDARDS, AND THAT ALL PLAYGROUNDS, EITHER 14 PUBLICLY OPERATED OR OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, MEET THE 15 NEW STANDARDS BY THE YEAR 2000, WHICH SOUNDED LIKE 16 17 A LONG TIME JUST A FEW YEARS BACK. 18 MEMBER GOTCH: RIGHT AROUND THE CORNER. I'LL HAVE SOME MORE TO ADD TO THIS LATER ON. 19 20 CHAIRMAN RELIS: IS THERE ANY, JUST OUT OF REFERENCE, IS THERE ANY COST COMPARISON TO --21 22 WHAT ARE THE OPTIONS FOR BRINGING A PLAYGROUND

MR. HARRINGTON: RIGHT NOW THERE IS IF --

TO BRING IT IN COMPLIANCE WITH CONSUMER PRODUCT

23

24

25

INTO COMPLIANCE?

1 SAFETY COMMISSION STANDARDS, SEVERAL MATERIALS COULD BE USED, INCLUDING VARIOUS LOOSE FILLS LIKE 2 3 SAND, BARK, THAT TYPE OF THING. HOWEVER, THE 4 REQUIREMENTS OF A.D.A., AMERICANS WITH 5 DISABILITIES ACT, REQUIRES THAT MOBILITY IMPAIRED 6 INDIVIDUALS BE PROVIDED ACCESS. 7 SO YOU'RE -- YOU'RE REALLY LOOKING 8 AT A RESILIENT SURFACE MATERIAL THAT WILL MEET THE 9 IMPACT STANDARD AND YET ALLOW ACCESSIBILITY, AND 10 THAT'S WHAT WE'VE DEVELOPED. WE'RE NOT OBVIOUSLY 11 THE ONLY COMPANY IN THE PLAYGROUND MAT BUSINESS, 12 BUT WE'RE PROBABLY THE ONLY COMPANY THAT IS USING A HUNDRED PERCENT CRUMB RUBBER FROM WHOLE TIRE 13 14 RECYCLING, INCLUDING THE COLOR PORTIONS. CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU. 15 16 MR. HARRINGTON: THANK YOU. 17 MEMBER GOTCH: MR. CHAIR, I WANTED TO LET 18 THE OTHER COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND MR. FRAZEE ALSO KNOW THAT I WILL BE CIRCULATING SOME MORE SPECIFIC 19 20 INFORMATION ON THIS ITEM CLOSER TO BOARD TIME. 2.1 BUT MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT MILLIONS OF TIRES CAN 22 BE USED TO ACCOMPLISH THIS IN OUR STATE. THANKS. 23 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU. OKAY.

WILLIAM LAX, JACKSON VALLEY ENERGY.

MR. LAX: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN. GOOD

24

1 MORNING, BOARD. COULD I DEFER MY COMMENTS TILL AFTER THE BOARD OF CORRECTIONS SPEAKS? THEY'RE ON 2 3 YOUR LIST. 4 CHAIRMAN RELIS: YES, YOU CAN. SO THIS 5 IS ROBERT WARNER, MULE CREEK STATE PRISON. 6 MR. WARNER: GOOD MORNING. I'D LIKE TO 7 INTRODUCE MYSELF TO THE BOARD. I'M JUST HERE ON 8 KIND OF AN INFORMATIONAL BASIS AND WAS MADE AWARE OF AN OPPORTUNITY THAT JACKSON ENERGY PARTNERS 9 10 HAS --11 CHAIRMAN RELIS: COULD YOU SPEAK INTO THE 12 MIKE, SIR? MR. LAX: SO IN ANY CASE, MY NAME IS 13 14 ROBERT WARNER. I'M FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF 15 CORRECTIONS AT MULE CREEK STATE PRISON. AND WE 16 OPERATE A RECYCLE AND SALVAGE PROGRAM AT MULE 17 CREEK THAT HAS IN LARGE PART BEEN WORKING UNDER WASTE MINIMIZATION RULES THAT THE BOARD'S 18 19 ESTABLISHED AND HAS SUCCESSFULLY DIVERTED AND IS 20 WORKING IN AMADOR COUNTY TO DIVERT AND PRACTICE 21 WASTE MINIMIZATION WHEREVER POSSIBLE IN ORDER TO 22 EXTEND STATE RESOURCES. 23 SO WE BECAME AWARE OF OPERATIONS THAT ARE ONGOING AT JACKSON VALLEY ENERGY 24

PARTNERS

1 WASTE-TO-ENERGY COGENERATION PLANT THAT'S LOCATED 2 OUT IN AMADOR COUNTY, THAT WE WANTED THE BOARD TO 3 BE AWARE THAT A SISTER AGENCY IN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS IS AVAILABLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE 4 POSSIBILITY OF TIRE RECYCLING AND OTHER WASTE 5 6 RECYCLING THAT MAY BECOME ELIGIBLE FOR A GRANT 7 RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BOARD MAY WANT TO 8 INVESTIGATE. 9 SO WE'RE JUST HERE TODAY TO ABSORB, TO OBSERVE THE WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD'S ACTIONS 10 RELATED TO THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MARKETS FOR 11 12 TIRE RECYCLING. WE'D LIKE TO VOLUNTEER OUR 13 AVAILABLE RESOURCES AT DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS TO ASSIST THE BOARD IN ANY MISSION THAT IT MAY 14 15 HAVE FOR TIRE RECYCLING. 16 WE BELIEVE THAT MULE CREEK DOES HAVE 17 THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE A TIRE RECYCLER AND TO 18 POSSIBLY MITIGATE COSTS THAT WOULD OTHERWISE BE UNDERTAKEN BY THE BOARD IN OTHER ACTIONS THAT 19 20 THEY'RE PROPOSING TO ENGAGE IN. SO MULE CREEK IS 21 AVAILABLE AS A POSSIBLE RESOURCE FOR TIRE 22 RECYCLING AND WOULD LIKE TO CONSIDER THAT THE 23 BOARD SUBSEQUENTLY MAY SEE A GRANT PROPOSAL FROM 24 MULE CREEK TO PLACE A TIRE SHREDDER OR SOME 25 SIMILAR OPERATION INTO PRACTICE UP IN AMADOR

1 COUNTY. 2 SO THAT'S SOMETHING THAT WE'D LIKE 3 TO INTRODUCE THE BOARD TO AS AN AVAILABLE GRANT ALTERNATIVE AND SEE THAT SUBSEQUENT ACTION MAY 4 5 COME TO YOUR ATTENTION ON THIS. 6 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 7 WILLIAM LAX THEN. 8 MR. LAX: ONCE AGAIN, GOOD MORNING. MY 9 NAME IS WILLIAM LAX, JACKSON VALLEY ENERGY. ACTUALLY MY STEPPING TO THE PODIUM HERE IS 10 TWOFOLD. ONE IS WHAT ROBERT JUST SPOKE ABOUT IS 11 THE IONE FACILITY, THE JACKSON VALLEY ENERGY 12 FACILITY, THAT IS CURRENTLY DOWN AND FACED WITH 13 THE VERY PROBLEM THAT MODESTO ENERGY IS FACED 14 WITH, THE CLIFF YEAR. WE ARE OUT OF OUR CLIFF 15 16 YEAR. WE ARE GOING TO TRY TO START BACK UP ON 17 S-RACK (PHONETIC) OR AVOIDED COST PLUS CAPACITY, 18 WHICH MAKES THAT VERY DIFFICULT WITH CURRENT FUEL 19 PRICING. 20 WE SEE THE CORRECTIONS FACILITY AS A 21 WAY TO GET PART OF OUR FUEL, WHICH IS TIRE-DERIVED 22 FUEL, THAT WE TARGETED, ALONG WITH OTHER AG WASTE 23 MATERIALS, WOOD MATERIALS, SO ON AND SO FORTH, TO

FIRE OUR PLANT AT IONE. WHAT'S SO APPEALING FOR

THE CORRECTIONS FACILITY IS IT'S VERY CLOSE TO US,

24

1 AND A LOT OF THE COST WITH THE TIRE HANDLING IS IN TRANSPORTATION WHERE WE'RE ONLY A FEW MILES AWAY 2 3 FROM THAT FACILITY. WE HAVE TO BURN CHIPPED 4 TIRES. THE ECONOMICS SEEMS BE COMING IN PLACE, 5 TALKING TO WASTE HAULERS WITHIN THE SACRAMENTO 6 AREA, SPECIFICALLY TTR AND SO ON AND SO FORTH, TO 7 ALLOW FOR THAT FUEL TO COME TO US AT ECONOMIC 8 VIABILITY. 9 THE SECOND POINT I'D LIKE TO MAKE 10 HERE IS JACKSON VALLEY ENERGY ALSO CAN BURN WASTE 11 TIRES FROM THE LEGACY PILES THAT ARE STREWN 12 THROUGHOUT THE STATE. THE LAST MEETING HELD HERE BY THIS COMMITTEE, I BELIEVE IT WAS RESOLVED TO 13 14 CLEAN UP THE LEGACY PILES BY FINDING LONG-TERM END USERS AND LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS TO THE LEGACY 15 PILES 16 AND THE ANNUAL FLOW THAT'S CREATED. ONE I BELIEVE 17 IS 30 MILLION FOR THE LEGACY, 10 MILLION FOR THE 18 ANNUAL WASTE STREAM.

JACKSON VALLEY ENERGY. I'VE BEEN TO SEVERAL

MEETINGS, HAVE NOT SPOKEN TO THIS COMMITTEE. I

UNDERSTAND PROBABLY BECAUSE OF THE TIMELINESS OF

AGAIN, I'D JUST LIKE TO INTRODUCE

19

20

21

| 23 | THIS INTRODUCTION, WE'D BE UNABLE TO HOPE FOR |
|-----------|--|
| ANY | |
| 24 | MONIES FOR 1997 FOR THE CORRECTION FACILITY OR |
| FOR 25 | JACKSON VALLEY, ALTHOUGH WE'RE NOT SEEKING ANY |

- 1 FUNDS FOR JACKSON VALLEY ALONE, BUT WE WOULD
- 2 CERTAINLY BE IN A PROPOSAL THROUGH 1997-98 AND
- 3 REQUEST FOR FUNDS MUCH LIKE MAYBE MODESTO ENERGY
- 4 IS DOING, BUT IN A WHOLE DIFFERENT SCOPE. THANK
- 5 YOU FOR YOUR TIME.
- 6 MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D
- 7 LIKE TO ASK, MR. LAX, YOUR BURNER, YOU HAVE TO USE
- 8 SHREDDED OR CHIPPED TIRES?
- 9 MR. LAX: IT HAS TO BE CHIPPED TIRES.
- 10 MEMBER PENNINGTON: DO YOU OWN THE
- 11 SHREDDER?
- MR. LAX: NO, WE DON'T. THAT'S WHY MULE
- 13 CREEK AND WE ARE IN DISCUSSIONS RIGHT NOW FOR THAT
- 14 VERY REASON.
- 15 MEMBER PENNINGTON: DOES MULE CREEK HAVE
- 16 A SHREDDER?
- 17 MR. LAX: NO, THEY DO NOT.
- 18 COULD I ELABORATE ON JUST ONE POINT
- 19 ON THAT QUESTION? BECAUSE IT HAS TO BE CHIPPED,
- 20 WE DID DO OUR HOMEWORK AND IN 1994, BECAUSE WE SAW
- 21 A WASTE PROBLEM AND BECAUSE OF THE CLIFF YEAR, WE
- 22 HAD TO GO OUT OF STATE TO FIND A CHIPPED TIRE THAT
- 23 WE COULD TEST AT OUR FACILITY. WE WENT TO OREGON
- 24 TO A COMPANY CALLED WASTE RECOVERY, AND WE BROUGHT
- 25 DOWN A HUNDRED TONS AT CONSIDERABLE EXPENSE AND

1 RAN IT THROUGH OUR FACILITY. SO WE DO HAVE SOME 2 EXPERIENCE WITH BURNING TIRES. 3 IT IS A CIRCULATING FLUIDIZED BED WITH VERY GOOD TECHNICAL AND EMISSION 4 CAPABILITIES. WE HAVE NO PROBLEMS. WE HOPE TO BE 5 6 PERMITTED FOR TIRES BY NOVEMBER 19TH OF THIS 7 MONTH. SO WE DIDN'T JUST FALL OFF THE WAGON HERE. 8 WE'VE BEEN AROUND FOR QUITE SOME TIME. 9 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YOU SAID THAT YOU COULD HANDLE THE LEGACY TIRE PILES. DOES THE DIRT 10 BOTHER YOU IN CHIPPING? 11 MR. LAX: NO. THE JACKSON VALLEY ENERGY 12 13 FACILITY IS FORMERLY A LIGNITE BURNING FACILITY. WHICH IS MINED LIGNITE, AND THE ASH CONTENT OF 14 LIGNITE IS RIGHT AROUND 35 TO 40 PERCENT. SO I 15 16 WOULD IMAGINE THE TIRES WOULD BE CONSIDERABLY LESS 17 THAN THAT. WE SEE THE ASH WOULD THEN -- BECAUSE 18 IT WILL BE CO-FIRED, OUR PLANS ARE TO CO-FIRE 19 TIRES ALONG WITH OTHER MATERIALS WITH LIGNITE. 20 AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT JACKSON 21 VALLEY OFFERS IS THE ASH, AND THE FACT THAT THE 22 ASH IS A QUELAND-TYPE ASH PRETTY MUCH WOULD 23 OVERPOWER A LOT OF THE METALS THAT MOST EVERYBODY

IS WORRIED ABOUT IN THEIR ASH, THE NICKEL, THE

WE DON'T SEE OUR

ZINC, AND SO ON AND SO FORTH.

24

1 ASH BEING A DISPOSAL PROBLEM. RIGHT NOW OUR ASH 2 USED FROM THE LIGNITE-FIRED PLANT IS USED AS A 3 SOIL REMEDIATION AGENT OVER IN THE PITTSBURG/ANTIOCH AREA FOR THE REFINERIES. SO TO 4 ANSWER YOUR QUESTION, THE ASH WOULD NOT BE A 5 6 PROBLEM. 7 MEMBER PENNINGTON: THANK YOU. 8 CHAIRMAN RELIS: MICHAEL BYRNE. 9 MR. BYRNE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE. I'M VERY ENCOURAGED 10 11 ABOUT MR. CHANDLER'S STATEMENT THAT HE MET WITH 12 MR. KEITH SEEGMILLER. HE'S A VERY GOOD MAN. I'VE 13 MET WITH HIM IN THE PAST. 14 I THINK THERE'S THREE ISSUES THAT HAVE TO BE DEALT WITH. THE ONE THAT MR. 15 CHANDLER 16 SPOKE OF WITH MR. SEEGMILLER IS BASICALLY THE CONTINUATION OF MELP AS A SOURCE FOR ELIMINATION 17 18 OF THESE TIRES. I VIEW THAT AS A MARKET 19 DEVELOPMENT ISSUE WHERE WE'LL LOSE A MARKET AND 20 WE'RE TRYING TO KEEP A MARKET GOING. 21 BUT THERE'S STILL TWO OTHER ISSUES

TO DEAL WITH AT THE WESTLEY FACILITY. THERE'S

22

THE

23 PILE ITSELF AND WHAT DO WE DO WITH THE SIX MILLION

24 TIRES THAT ARE CURRENTLY GOING THERE.

25 I SUBMITTED A PROPOSAL TO THE BOARD

IN JULY, STATING THAT AROUND \$1.2 MILLION -- YOU 1 KNOW, WE DIVERT TIRES ELSEWHERE, AND THAT WOULD 2 3 JUST ABOUT ELIMINATE THE PILE THERE. THAT WAS IN 4 JULY. IT'S NOW NOVEMBER. THE 1.2 MILLION NUMBER 5 IS NO LONGER NECESSARY BECAUSE WE'VE LOST THREE OR б FOUR MONTHS. 7 SO WHAT I WOULD SUGGEST IS IF ITS 8 PROPOSAL, EITHER THE OXFORD PROPOSAL OR THE MELP PROPOSAL OR THE BOARD STAFF PROPOSAL, IS GOING TO 9 10 GET ANY KIND OF SERIOUS CONSIDERATION, WE'VE GOT 11 TO MEET RIGHT NOW. WE'VE GOT ALL THE PLAYERS AT A 12 TABLE, FIND OUT WHAT THE ISSUES ARE, FIND OUT IF THERE'S ANY ISSUES THAT WE AGREE ON, FIND OUT WHAT 13 14 THE ISSUES ARE THAT WE DISAGREE WITH THEM, AND GET 15 THROUGH THAT PROCESS AS RAPIDLY AS POSSIBLE SO 16 THAT AN ISSUE CAN BE BROUGHT BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE 17 AND THE FULL BOARD WHILE THE TIME STILL LASTS TO 18 DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE PILE. 19 BASICALLY MY COMMENTS. I'D JUST ASK 20 YOU IF YOU COULD HELP US GET TOGETHER, WE WOULD 21 REALLY APPRECIATE THAT. 22 MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK 23 THAT WE CAN CERTAINLY FACILITATE A MEETING. I 2.4 DON'T THINK THAT THAT'S A PROBLEM. I THINK THAT

THERE ARE JUST AN ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF ISSUES

INVOLVED HERE, AND EVERY DAY THE PLAYING FIELD 1 CHANGES A LITTLE BIT. AND I REALIZE THAT IF 2 3 THINGS STAY THE WAY THEY ARE TODAY, THAT CLIFF 4 DATE WOULD COME AND WE WILL HAVE MISSED AN 5 OPPORTUNITY. 6 HOWEVER, WE SEE THAT THERE MAY BE 7 SOME OTHER OPTIONS THAT WE WANT TO EXPLORE, AND I 8 THINK AT THAT POINT WE'LL HAVE A BETTER IDEA. THERE'S THIS MAJOR LEGISLATION AND MAJOR CHANGES 9 10 IN THE ENERGY INDUSTRY ITSELF. I THINK ALL THOSE 11 THINGS WE HAVEN'T HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO FULLY 12 UNDERSTAND WHAT IMPACT THEY HAVE ON MELP OR THE LEGACY TIRE PILES IN AND OF ITSELF. 13 14 MR. BYRNE: MR. PENNINGTON, I AGREE WITH 15 THAT A HUNDRED PERCENT. I AGREE THAT THERE'S A HOST OF ISSUES. I'VE BEEN UP HERE SAYING THAT 16 17 THAT CLIFF DATE IS GOING TO RUIN US. THAT'S JUST 18 MY ASSUMPTION. IF YOU LOOK INTO IT, AND MR. CHANDLER HAS SAID IS THAT CLIFF DATE REAL, IS 19 20 THERE SOMETHING THAT CAN BE DONE TO CONTINUE THAT. 21 BUT FROM OUR POSITION, WE HAVE NOT 22 YET SEEN THE MELP PROPOSAL, YET THAT'S A PROPOSAL THAT HAS BEEN SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD. I DON'T 23

KNOW WHAT'S IN IT. I DON'T KNOW WHAT ISN'T IN

IT.
25 WE HAVEN'T HAD AN OPPORTUNITY WITH STAFF ON THEIR

1 CONCERNS. I KNOW THEY MENTIONED THAT OUR PROPOSAL 2 DIDN'T EVEN TALK ABOUT WHO'S GOING TO MOVE THE 3 TIRES FROM THE PILE TO THE BELT. I WOULD JUST 4 LIKE TO GET TOGETHER AND FOCUS ON THOSE ISSUES AND 5 NOT CLOSE THE DOOR ON ANY OTHER ANALYSIS THAT'S 6 GOING ON, JUST SO WE CAN BEGIN DISCUSSIONS TO FIND 7 OUT, YOU KNOW, IF THIS THING CAN FLY OR NOT. 8 MEMBER PENNINGTON: WELL, AS YOU KNOW, 9 ANY TIME YOU WANT TO MAKE AN APPOINTMENT AND COME 10 IN AND SEE ME, I'M MORE THAN HAPPY TO SEE YOU, AND I'M SURE THAT'S TRUE WITH ALL THE OTHER BOARD 11 12 MEMBERS. AND OBVIOUSLY THE BOARD MEMBERS CAN'T 13 INVOLVE THEMSELVES IN TOO MANY PEOPLE BEING AROUND OTHER BOARD MEMBERS. I KNOW STAFF AND MR. 14 15 CHANDLER ARE ALWAYS PREPARED TO MEET WITH YOU, SO WE'RE PREPARED TO MEET WITH YOU. WE MAY NOT HAVE 16 17 THE ANSWER YOU WANT. 18 MR. BYRNE: WHAT I'M KIND OF LOOKING FOR 19 IS YOU TO GET US AND MELP HERE SO THAT WE BOTH

COME IN HERE AND COME AND SIT AT THE TABLE AND

| 21 | INITIATE SOME DISCUSSIONS MAYBE BETWEEN THE TWO |
|----------|--|
| OF | |
| 22 | US T00. |
| 23 | MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY. |
| 24 25 | CHAIRMAN RELIS: MR. CHANDLER, DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING TO ADD? |

1 MR. CHANDLER: I DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM IN 2 CONVENING A MEETING. I WOULD JUST REMIND THE 3 BOARD THAT YOU ALL DID ADDRESS THE SHORT-TERM ELIMINATION OF THAT PILE THIS PAST APRIL. AND SO 4 5 IF YOU MAKE THE ASSUMPTION, GRANTED IT'S A LARGE 6 ONE, THAT MELP IS ABLE TO CONTINUE TO OPERATE PAST 7 SEPTEMBER OF '97 THROUGH SOME TYPE OF FINANCIAL 8 ARRANGEMENT THAT WORKS, WHETHER IT'S ON THE ENERGY 9 PAYMENT SIDE OR SOME TYPE OF RESTRUCTURE OF THEIR DEBT, WE HAVE IN PLACE THE ELIMINATION OF THAT 10 PILE THROUGH A PERMIT THAT GOVERNS THE REMOVAL OF 11 THAT PILE, WHICH I WOULD LIKE -- I'M SURE MR. 12 BYRNE WOULD REITERATE, IS OTR'S INTENTION TO 13 ELIMINATE THE PILE. 14 15 MR. BYRNE: EXACTLY. 16 MR. CHANDLER: SO I DON'T WANT TO LOSE 17 SIGHT OF THE FACT THAT WE HAVE TAKEN A 18 RESPONSIBILITY TO TRY TO DO, AND I THINK WE ALL SIMILARLY RECOGNIZE THAT THAT BURNDOWN SCENARIO 19 20 ONLY WORKS IF THAT FACILITY IS STILL THERE BEYOND 21 THE SEPTEMBER '97 DATE. CERTAINLY WE CAN BRING 22 MORE MEETINGS TO THE TABLE AND HAVE THOSE 23 DISCUSSIONS. I THINK, AGAIN, THE PERSPECTIVE 24 THAT

THE CPCFA CONVERSATIONS BROUGHT TO THE TABLE IS

1 DOES THE STATE WANT TO ENSURE THAT THERE'S THAT 2 FACILITY EITHER IN THE SHORT TERM OR THE LONGER 3 TERM, THERE TO BE A RESOURCE FOR THE REMOVAL AND CONSUMPTION OF THESE TIRES STATEWIDE. THAT'S KIND 4 OF THE FOCUS WE'RE LOOKING AT RIGHT NOW. BUT AS 5 6 MR. BYRNE KNOWS, I'D BE WILLING TO CONVENE A 7 MEETING AND HAVE MORE DISCUSSIONS ON THIS MATTER 8 WITH HIM. 9 MR. BYRNE: IN ALL FAIRNESS, MR. CHANDLER HAS BEEN MOST HELPFUL ON THESE ACTIVITIES. AND I 10 AGREE. THE PERMIT'S IN PLACE. IF MELP CONTINUES 11 12 BEYOND THE CLIFF DATE AND IF THE PRICE TO DISPOSE 13 OF TIRES REMAINS 16 CENTS OR SOMEWHERE NEAR THAT NUMBER, THEN WE'VE GOT A PERMIT IN PLACE THAT 14 WE'VE COMMITTED TO THAT WE'RE GOING TO GET RID OF 15 THAT PILE. THE TROUBLE IS THERE'S A LOT OF IFS IN 16 17 THAT SCENARIO. AND THOSE IFS REQUIRE THAT SMALL 18 COMPANY DOWN THERE TO MAKE DECISIONS. 19 YOU KNOW, ARE WE GOING TO EXIST 20 AFTER THE CLIFF DATE? AND, YOU KNOW, WE WEREN'T 21 PARTY TO THE DISCUSSIONS WITH MR. SEEGMILLER, AND 22 I'M NOT SUGGESTING THAT WE SHOULD HAVE BEEN. WE'D 23 JUST LIKE TO KIND OF GET A FEEL FOR WHAT'S --24 WHAT'S COOKING AND WHERE THIS THING IS HEADED. 25 CHAIRMAN RELIS: FROM WHAT I GATHER, MR.

1 CHANDLER WILL BE FOLLOWING UP AND HAVING A MEETING WITH YOU, AND YOU ARE FREE TO MEET, CERTAINLY, 2 3 WITH BOARD MEMBERS AND LEARN ALL YOU CAN ABOUT 4 WHAT THE ONGOING WORK OF THE BOARD IS TO TRY AND 5 BRING THIS MATTER TO SOME CLOSURE. б MR. BRYNE: THANK YOU. 7 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU. JACK MICHAEL REPRESENTING L.A. COUNTY. 8 9 MR. MICHAEL: CHAIRMAN RELIS, MEMBERS OF 10 THE COMMITTEE, I'M JACK MICHAEL REPRESENTING LOS 11 ANGELES COUNTY, PARTICULARLY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC 12 WORKS. JUST A FEW WORDS TO INDICATE WHAT HAS TAKEN PLACE SINCE YOUR LAST COMMITTEE MEETING. 13 14 CERTAINLY WON'T GO INTO ANY MORE 15 DETAIL ON OUR PROPOSAL. I BELIEVE YOU'RE FULLY 16 AWARE OF THAT. WILL INDICATE THAT WE MADE AN 17 EXTENSIVE EFFORT TO TRY TO DEVELOP SOME SORT OF A 18 JOINT APPROACH WITH THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES. AS OF LATE ON FRIDAY, THE BOARD OF 19 20 PUBLIC WORKS, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, HAD DECIDED THAT 21 THEY WERE NOT INTERESTED IN A JOINT PROJECT AS 22 SUCH. MY -- I'VE NOT SEEN ANYTHING IN WRITING 23 FROM THEM, BY THE WAY. I DON'T KNOW IF ANYBODY 24 ELSE HAS. MY UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THEY WERE

PROPOSING IS, AS I UNDERSTOOD IT, MORE OR LESS AN

1 EXTENSION OF THEIR USE OF RUBBER IN THEIR RECYCLED ASPHALT PROJECT, WHICH I BELIEVE THEY ALREADY GOT 2 3 A GRANT FROM THE BOARD. 4 SO WE'RE STILL VERY INTERESTED IN 5 PURSUING OUR PROJECT. WOULD HOPE THAT THE б ALLOCATION THAT THE COMMITTEE MADE PREVIOUSLY FOR 7 THAT MARKET DEVELOPMENT APPROACH WOULD REMAIN, AND 8 WE BELIEVE THAT WE WOULD HAVE THE ABILITY OF EXTENDING THIS TECHNOLOGY AND ASSISTANCE TO 9 10 COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE STATE AS A MAJOR MARKET 11 DEVELOPMENT EFFORT FOR THE USE OF TIRES. 12 CHAIRMAN RELIS: JUST POINT OF CLARIFICATION. THERE HAVE BEEN SOME CONCERN 13 14 EXPRESSED BY OUR STAFF ABOUT THE ISSUE IN YOUR 15 PROPOSAL, AS I UNDERSTAND YOUR PROPOSAL, EQUIPMENT 16 VERSUS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, WHETHER THE BULK OF 17 WHAT YOU HAVE IN MIND IS TO PURCHASE EQUIPMENT OR WHETHER YOU'RE FLEXIBLE ON THAT VIS-A-VIS THE 18 19 BOARD'S INTEREST PRIMARILY OF THE TECHNICAL 20 ASSISTANCE SIDE OR STAFF'S CONCERN ABOUT THAT. 21 MR. MICHAEL: CLEARLY WE'RE WILLING TO 22 WORK WITH YOU AND THE STAFF ON THE FUNDING. 23 THINK PART OF THE ISSUE HERE IS THAT OUR PROPOSAL 2.4 AND WHAT THE STAFF HAD ORIGINALLY SUBMITTED TO THE 25 BOARD WAS ON A MULTI-YEAR FUNDING BASIS, A

THREE-YEAR FUNDING BASIS, WHICH OUR PROPOSAL WAS 1 2 AS WELL. 3 CLEARLY ON THE FRONT END THERE IS AN 4 AMOUNT IN OUR PROPOSAL FOR THE PURCHASE OF 5 EQUIPMENT THAT IS VERY IMPORTANT, WE THINK, TO б ULTIMATELY BRINGING THIS MARKET DEVELOPMENT 7 PROGRAM UP TO SPEED QUICKLY. SO THAT'S WHY IN OUR 8 PROPOSAL THE INITIAL YEAR OF FUNDING WAS HIGHER BECAUSE THERE IS A PIECE OF EQUIPMENT THAT IS NOT 9 10 AVAILABLE YET AT THE CITY, ALTHOUGH THEY, AS I 11 BELIEVE, INDICATED, THEY HAD ALL THE EQUIPMENT. 12 IT'S A MAJOR PIECE OF EQUIPMENT THAT IS EXPENSIVE, BUT WE ARE WILLING TO WORK, IF WE'RE TALKING ABOUT 13 14 A MULTI-YEAR PROGRAM AND EVEN WITHIN A SINGLE-YEAR 15 PROGRAM, TO WORK WITH THE BOARD AND THE COMMITTEE ON HOW WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH THIS. 16 17 OUR OBJECTIVE, AS I MENTIONED AT THE 18 LAST COMMITTEE MEETING, IS WE'RE COMMITTED TO 19 GOING AHEAD WITH WORK AS IT RELATES TO OUR COUNTY, 20 AND PARTICULARLY UNINCORPORATED AREA IN OUR COUNTY 21 AND OUR CONTRACTS WITH -- OUR NATURAL CONTRACT 22 ARRANGEMENT WITH OUR CITIES. BUT WHAT WE'RE 23 ASKING THE BOARD FOR IS SOME ASSISTANCE TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND HAVE THE 2.4

ADDITIONAL KNOWLEDGE THROUGH TESTING OF WHAT THE

- 1 ULTIMATE MIXES CAN BE FOR THIS MATERIAL TO MAKE IT
- 2 AVAILABLE TO COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE STATE.
- 3 AND THAT WOULDN'T BE SOMETHING THAT WE WOULD
- 4 NORMALLY DO USING OUR OWN FUNDING. THAT IS THE
- 5 ESSENCE OF THE MONEY THAT WE'RE ASKING FOR IS TO
- 6 BE ABLE TO EXTEND THAT NOT ONLY TO OTHER
- 7 COMMUNITIES, BUT TO THE CONTRACTING COMMUNITY AS
- 8 WELL.
- 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING,
- 10 AND I THINK THE BOARD -- OTHER MEMBERS UNDERSTAND
- 11 THIS AS WELL, THAT YOU ARE -- IN YOUR PROPOSAL
- 12 YOU'RE LOOKING AT A MULTI-YEAR, BEARING IN MIND,
- 13 OF COURSE, WE APPROPRIATE ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, BUT
- 14 YOUR CONCEPT OR YOUR APPROACH IS VIEWED AS A
- 15 THREE-YEAR PROPOSAL.
- MR. MICHAEL: THAT'S CORRECT.
- 17 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. ANY QUESTIONS?
- 18 THANK YOU.
- MR. MICHAEL: THANK YOU.
- 20 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. JOLENE PANDZA.
- 21 MS. PANDZA: GOOD MORNING. I'M JOLENE
- 22 PANDZA FROM AMERICAN TIRE DISPOSAL. AND BOARD
- 23 MEMBER GOTCH MADE THE COMMENT IN HER EX PARTES
- 24 THAT WE HAD A CHANCE TO MEET OVER THE TELEPHONE
- 25 YESTERDAY. AND I'D LIKE TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY,

1 IF ANYBODY ELSE HAS TIME IN THE NEAR FUTURE, TO DO 2 THE SAME, AND I'LL BE CONTACTING YOU TO SET THAT 3 UP POSSIBLY. I JUST WANTED TO LET THE MEMBERS 4 KNOW AND THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS KNOW THAT WE AS 5 6 AMERICAN TIRE DISPOSAL WERE THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 7 LAST THREE TIRE CLEANUPS THAT WE PERFORMED THROUGH 8 SUKUT, WHO'S THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR FOR THE STATE. 9 AND WE CURRENTLY ARE PERFORMING THE FOURTH ONE IN BAKERSFIELD AS WE SPEAK. AS OF THIS MORNING, THEY 10 WERE GOING WELL. THEY'VE ACTUALLY STARTED LOADING 11 TIRES. AND MY OFFICE STATED THAT THEY WERE GOING 12 13 AS WELL AS THE OTHER ONES HAD GONE. 14 AND I HAD A CONCERN, OUR OFFICE HAS A CONCERN ABOUT THE ALLOCATED FUNDS THAT THE BOARD 15 HAS OR THE COMMITTEE HAS BROUGHT UP AS FAR AS 16 17 FUTURE CLEANUP FOR THE NEXT YEAR'S BUDGET. AND I 18 KNOW THAT THERE ARE SOME CLEANUPS THAT ARE BROUGHT TO THE COMMITTEE TOMORROW, AND I KNOW ONE OF THE 19 20 PILES THERE IS QUITE LARGE. AND IF YOU WERE TO 21 LIMIT THE AMOUNT OF FUNDS BASED -- I KNOW \$500,000 WAS MENTIONED IN THE LAST COMMITTEE MEETING. THAT 22 23 ONE CLEANUP ALONE COULD WIPE OUT THAT ENTIRE FUND 24 IF IT POTENTIALLY IS AS BIG AS IT SAYS TO BE.

SO I'D LIKE THE COMMITTEE TO TAKE A

1 GOOD LOOK AT THAT. AND IF THE AGENDA OR THE IDEA 2 IS TO GET AS MANY OF THE CLEANUPS DONE IN THE NEAR 3 FUTURE, THAT THEY REALLY LOOK AT THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT'S GOING TO BE ALLOCATED TOWARDS THE 4 5 CLEANUPS IN THE NEXT YEAR'S BUDGETS. 6 THE JOBS THAT WE HAVE PERFORMED HAVE 7 BEEN DONE EFFICIENTLY, TIMELY, AND FOR LESS MONEY 8 THAN ALL THE OTHER PRIOR CLEANUPS, I BELIEVE, HAVE 9 BEEN DONE. THE STAFF HAD ESTIMATED, I THINK, \$3 A TIRE FOR THE CLEANUPS THAT WE PERFORMED, AND THE 10 AVERAGE CAME IN AT A DOLLAR TWENTY-TWO A TIRE 11 USING OUR PROCEDURES AND OUR COMPANY FOR DOING 12 13 THAT. OBVIOUSLY IF THE COMMITTEE AND BOARD 14 15 HAS THE -- TRYING TO GET THIS OUT -- THE IDEA OF 16 END USE FOR THE TIRE CLEANUPS OR FOR THE COMPANIES 17 THAT ARE BIDDING THESE CONTRACTS, I FIND IT HARD 18 THAT THE COMMITTEE OR BOARD WOULD BE ABLE TO JUSTIFY THE FACT OF IT GOING TO AN END USE IF IT'S 19 20 GOING TO BE MORE THAN 60 PERCENT OF WHAT THE 21 ACTUAL COST WAS FOR US TO DO THE CLEANUPS. I 22 THINK THAT NEEDS TO BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION, 23 THAT WE COULD DO POSSIBLY TWO OR THREE CLEANUPS 24 FOR THE AMOUNT OF WHAT THE STAFF HAD ORIGINALLY 25 STATED THE AMOUNT OF TIRES TO CLEAN IT UP.

1 CHAIRMAN RELIS: MAY I ASK JUST WHERE YOU 2 GET THE NUMBER 60 PERCENT? I'M JUST CURIOUS. 3 MS. PANDZA: BECAUSE BASED ON WHERE THE ORIGINAL ESTIMATES WERE WHEN WE RECEIVED THE 4 5 CONTRACTS OR THE REQUEST FOR BID, THERE WAS AN 6 ALLOCATED AMOUNT THAT'S BEEN IN ALL THE ITEMS OF 7 PREVIOUS MEETINGS AND WHAT THE ALLOCATED AMOUNTS 8 WERE FOR THE CLEANUPS AND ALL THE LEGACY PILES, I 9 BELIEVE IT WAS IN THE WORKSHOP, IT HAD TIRE PILE CLEANUPS WITH THE ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF TIRES AND 10 11 THE ESTIMATED AMOUNT FOR THE CLEANUPS. 12 AND IN THE MEETING FOR TOMORROW, I 13 KNOW WE HAVE THAT ALSO BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY THERE ARE CONCERNS THAT WE WOULD LIKE TO BE ABLE TO BID THE 14 CONTRACTS. IT'S STATED THAT THE TIRES WERE 15 ACTUALLY CLEANED UP FOR A DOLLAR TWENTY-TWO A TIRE 16 17 IN THE CONTRACTS THAT WE HAVE PERFORMED, WHICH IS 18 60 PERCENT LESS OF THE --19 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OH, I SEE. SO YOU ARE 20 SAYING YOU'VE OPERATED AT 60 PERCENT UNDER THE 21 GENERAL NUMBER THAT THE BOARD HAS REFERENCED. MS. PANDZA: RIGHT. 22 23 MEMBER PENNINGTON: COULD I PURSUE THAT 24 JUST A LITTLE BIT? ARE YOU SAYING THAT THE

REQUIREMENT FOR END USE OF THE SCRAP TIRE AFTER

1 THE CLEANUP IS COSTING 60 PERCENT? 2 MS. PANDZA: WHAT I WAS JUST MAKING THE 3 COMMENT WAS THAT THE ORIGINAL ESTIMATED AMOUNT FOR THE CLEANUPS WERE \$3 A TIRE. WE DID IT FOR A 4 5 DOLLAR TWENTY-TWO A TIRE ON AN AVERAGE. SO I KNOW 6 THERE'S A CONCERN, BECAUSE I DO NOT HAVE -- I HAVE 7 END USES, BUT I KNOW THE BIG, BROAD SUBJECT OF 8 WHERE THE TIRES ARE GOING OUT OF THE LEGACY PILES. 9 THE TIRES THAT WE PICKED UP WERE NOT SUITABLE, GOOD PERCENTAGES OF THEM, AND I WOULD SAY MORE 10 THAN 50 PERCENT WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN SUITABLE FOR 11 CEMENT KILNS BECAUSE OF THE RIMS THAT WERE 12 13 INCLUDED IN THEM. WE HAVE SEVERAL TONS OF RIMS. THE TIRE SIZE AND BECAUSE OF THE DIRT FACTOR. 14 THE TIRES THAT WE CLEANED UP WERE SHREDDED AND 15 16 LANDFILLED, AND WE DID IT FOR 60 PERCENT LESS THAN 17 WHAT WAS ORIGINALLY ESTIMATED FOR THE CLEANUP TO 18 COST. 19 MEMBER PENNINGTON: IF YOU HAD SEPARATED 20 THOSE TIRES, WOULD THAT HAVE COST 60 PERCENT MORE? 21 MS. PANDZA: IF WE HAD SEPARATED THEM TO 22 TIRES THAT WERE SUITABLE AND NOT SUITABLE? NO, I 23 DON'T BELIEVE IT WOULD HAVE COST 60 PERCENT MORE. 24 OBVIOUSLY IT WOULD HAVE HAD MORE MANPOWER 25 INVOLVED. NOW, WE DO DO TIRE SORTING ON OUR

- 1 NORMAL DAILY OPERATIONS, AND WE DID, WHILE WE WERE
- 2 DOING THE CLEANUPS, INSPECT THE TIRES TO THE BEST
- 3 EXTENT THAT WE COULD.
- 4 DUE TO THE TYPE OF OPERATION THAT WE
- 5 USE ON THE CLEANUPS, THE STAFF MEMBERS THAT HAVE
- 6 BEEN OUT THERE WOULD BE ABLE TO TELL YOU THAT WE
- 7 DO IT QUICKLY. WE CAN LOAD AN AVERAGE OF ABOUT A
- 8 HUNDRED TIRES WITH ONE BUCKETFUL OF OUR MACHINE
- 9 THAT WE USE. IT WOULD TAKE, OH, PROBABLY 15
- 10 MINUTES OR MORE OF A MANPOWER TO BE ABLE TO DO
- 11 THAT IF YOU HAD TO DO THAT. WE CAN DO IT IN A
- 12 MATTER OF MINUTES. SO OUR COSTS ARE LESS BASED

ON

- 13 THE WAY WE DO OUR PROCEDURES.
- 14 MEMBER PENNINGTON: THANK YOU.
- MS. PANDZA: AND ACTUALLY I GUESS

THAT'S

- 16 IT.
- 17 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
- 18 ROBERT SCHWARTZ, ALL AMERICAN ASPHALT.
- 19 MR. SCHWARTZ: GOOD MORNING. I'D LIKE

TO

20 SPEAK BRIEFLY IN SUPPORT OF L.A. COUNTY'S

PROPOSAL

21 FROM -- I'M REPRESENTING A CONTRACTOR AND

ASPHALT

22 CONCRETE PRODUCER, ALL AMERICAN ASPHALT COMPANY.

23 CHAIRMAN RELIS: FINALLY ONE OF THE

REAL

USERS.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I'M NOT A VERY GOOD

- 1 SPEAKER, BUT I'M KIND OF IN THE TRENCHES THERE.
- 2 SO I'D LIKE TO COMMENT ON IT. BASICALLY OUR
- 3 COMPANY PRODUCES APPROXIMATELY THREE MILLION

TON

AMOUNT

- 4 OF AC A YEAR OF THE ROUGHLY -- CONSIDERABLE
- 5 OF THE 50 MILLION TON OF AC PRODUCED IN

CALIFORNIA

- 6 A YEAR. WE EMPLOY APPROXIMATELY 500 EMPLOYEES,
- 7 AND WE HAVE THREE ASPHALT CONCRETE PLANTS IN
- 8 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. NOW --
- 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: ARE YOU ONE OF THE
- 10 OWNERS?
- 11 MR. SCHWARTZ: NO, I'M NOT AN OWNER.
- 12 RECENTLY WE BUILT A NEW FACILITY

ΙN

- 13 IRVINE THAT WAS DESIGNED SPECIFICALLY TO
- 14 INCORPORATE SCRAP TIRES INTO THE PLANT TO

PRODUCE

15 RUBBERIZED AC, AND IT'S THOUGHT TO BE THE

LARGEST

16 PLANT IN THE WORLD. IT RUNS APPROXIMATELY 600

TON

- 17 AN HOUR OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE, WHICH
- IS

| 10 | MAIBE APPROXIMATELY 1500 SCRAP TIRES PER HOUR |
|-----------|---|
| THAT | |
| 19 | WE CAN RUN THROUGH OUR PLANT TO MAKE RUBBERIZED |
| 20 | ASPHALT CONCRETE. |
| 21 | WITH THIS NEW FACILITY, WE |
| DEVELOPED | |
| 22 | A NEW TECHNOLOGY TO MAKE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT |
| 23 | CONCRETE. ONE OF THE MAJOR OBSTACLES WE'VE HAD |
| IN | |
| 24 | INCREASING THE USAGE OF THIS PRODUCT HAS BEEN |
| THE 25 | LACK OF ANY KIND OF CENTRAL RESEARCH FACILITY |

1 WHERE NEW TECHNOLOGIES CAN BE BROUGHT TO STUDY, TEST IT, AND DISTRIBUTE IT OUT TO THE AGENCIES 2 3 THAT ARE GOING TO USE THESE PRODUCTS. AND I HAD A LOT OF TESTING DONE ON 4 5 MY OWN THROUGH SOME OF THE OUTSIDE LABORATORIES, 6 BUT COMING FROM A CONTRACTOR'S POINT OF VIEW, YOU 7 LACK A CERTAIN CREDIBILITY WHEN YOU DO THE TESTING 8 YOURSELF; WHEREAS, IF YOU TAKE AN AGENCY LIKE L.A. 9 COUNTY, WHO'S ALWAYS BEEN A LEADER, IN MY OPINION, OF RECYCLED ASPHALT CONCRETE AND NOW IN RUBBERIZED 10 ASPHALT CONCRETE, YOU TAKE THEIR LEADERSHIP AND 11 THEIR CREDIBILITY AND DEVELOP A RESEARCH CENTER. 12 13 WHEREAS, THE CONTRACTORS, THE PRODUCERS, THE USER AGENCIES IN THE AREA CAN ALL SHARE THIS 14 INFORMATION THAT'S DEVELOPED. AND TO ME THAT'S 15 16 CRUCIAL FOR THE FURTHER USAGE OF RUBBERIZED 17 ASPHALT CONCRETE. 18 THE WAY THE MARKET IS RIGHT NOW IS WHEN THESE PROJECTS ARE PUT OUT TO BID, MAJORITY 19 20 OF THEM ARE PUT OUT AS A BASE BID USING CONVENTIONAL ASPHALT CONCRETE AND AN ALTERNATE 21 22 USING RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE. AND TO ME THE 23 MAIN THING THAT NEEDS TO HAPPEN IS THAT THE COST 24 IS IN COMPARISON WITH THE OTHER REMEDIAL

STRATEGIES; IN OTHER WORDS, THE CONVENTIONAL AC,

THE USAGE OF RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE WON'T

1

PROLIFERATE OR EVEN SUCCEED IN THE FUTURE. 2 3 IF YOU HAVE A RESEARCH CENTER WHERE 4 YOU CAN DEVELOP THE NEW TECHNOLOGY SUCH AS ALL 5 AMERICAN HAS AND SHARE THAT INFORMATION, AND ONE б OF THE MAIN PROBLEMS WITH THE RUBBERIZED AC IS NO 7 ONE REALLY KNOWS WHAT MAKES A GOOD PRODUCT, WHAT 8 PERFORMANCE CRITERIA WE'RE LOOKING FOR. ALL THESE 9 THINGS ARE KIND OF UP IN THE AIR. AND, THUS, 10 PEOPLE AREN'T APT TO USE IT WHEN THEY DON'T KNOW 11 MUCH ABOUT IT. 12 BUT AGAIN, A RESEARCH CENTER OR FACILITY WHERE THIS INFORMATION CAN BE BROUGHT IN, 13 14 STUDIED, AND DISTRIBUTED OUTWARD TO THE COMMUNITY, 15 BOTH FROM THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR, TO ME, IS 16 CRUCIAL TO BRING THE NEW TECHNOLOGIES IN, COST OF 17 THE RUBBERIZED AC DOWN, AND THUS IMPLEMENT THE 18 SUCCESS OF THE PRODUCT. 19 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU A 20 COUPLE OF QUESTIONS. SINCE YOU ARE THE FIRST 21 PARTY THAT HAS COME FORWARD WHO'S A PRODUCER, 22 WE'VE HEARD BEFORE THIS COMMITTEE AND FROM L.A. 23 COUNTY THAT THEY'VE HAD A VERY GOOD SUCCESS RATE 2.4 USING RUBBERIZED ASPHALT IN THEIR SPONSORED 25 PROJECTS. AND I TAKE IT YOU ARE A CONTRACTOR OR

- 1 HAVE BEEN A VERY LARGE ONE.
- 2 MR. SCHWARTZ: WE'RE A PRIVATELY OWNED
- 3 COMPANY, BUT WE'RE A LARGE PRODUCER. AND TO
- 4 ANSWER YOUR QUESTION, YES, L.A. COUNTY HAS HAD A
- 5 TREMENDOUS SUCCESS RATE ON THE RUBBERIZED AC
- 6 PRODUCTS. I'D SAY SO MUCH BETTER THAN ANY OTHER
- 7 OF THE AGENCIES AND, FOR THAT MATTER, THE STATE OF
- 8 CALIFORNIA.
- 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: AND YOU HAVE ACTUALLY
- 10 MANUFACTURED PRODUCT THAT HAS BEEN USED?
- MR. SCHWARTZ: YES.
- 12 CHAIRMAN RELIS: AND INTERACTED WITH THE
- 13 COUNTY ON THE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS?
- MR. SCHWARTZ: FOR THE RUBBERIZED AC,
- 15 CORRECT. FOR CONVENTIONAL I'VE WORKED WITH THE
- 16 COUNTY FOR MANY YEARS. AND, IN FACT, THIS WEEK --
- 17 TODAY THERE'S A 13,000-TON JOB BIDDING IN L.A.
- 18 COUNTY FOR RUBBERIZED AC. AND THIS MONTH OUR
- 19 COMPANY ALONE WILL PRODUCE MATERIAL FOR TWO
- L.A.
- 20 COUNTY PROJECTS TOTALLING ANOTHER ROUGHLY
- 15,000
- 21 TON. OF ALL THE AGENCIES IN SOUTHERN
- CALIFORNIA,
- L.A. COUNTY BY FAR AND AWAY SPECIFIES MORE

- 23 RUBBERIZED AC THAN ANY OF THE OTHER AGENCIES.
- 24 CHAIRMAN RELIS: AND THE OTHER

ASSERTION

25 MADE -- CLAIM MADE WAS THAT L.A. COUNTY HAS BEEN

1 ABLE TO ACTUALLY SAVE MONEY ON A PER MILE LAID 2 BASIS OF, I BELIEVE THE NUMBER WAS, \$60,000 PER 3 ROAD MILE. WHAT'S YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH THE COST STRUCTURE BECAUSE WE HAVE -- IN FACT, I DIDN'T 4 5 REPORT THIS. BUT IF YOU GO BACK TO OUR ITEM NO. 1 6 TODAY, WHICH WAS THE TIRE STUDY, THERE'S A 7 STATEMENT MADE IN THERE WHICH I WAS THINKING ABOUT 8 IN LIGHT OF THE L.A. COUNTY TESTIMONY. 9 ON PAGE 12 IT SAYS OUR AC PROJECTS HAVE HIGHER INSTALLATION COSTS ON THE ORDER OF 30 10 TO A 100 PERCENT ABOVE CONVENTIONAL ASPHALT 11 12 PAVEMENTS. AND THAT IS NOT WHAT WE HAVE HEARD 13 FROM L.A. COUNTY. IT WOULDN'T ADD UP WITH THE \$60,000 PER ROAD MILE SAVING UNLESS I'M 14 FUNDAMENTALLY MISSING SOMETHING HERE. 15 MR. SCHWARTZ: THE WAY IT REALLY COMES 16 17 DOWN IS RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE IS MORE 18 EXPENSIVE THAN CONVENTIONAL. BUT DUE TO THE UNIQUE PROPERTIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE MODIFIED 19 20 BINDERS DUE TO THE SCRAP TIRES, THE TRADITIONAL 21 APPROACH HAS BEEN TO REDUCE THE THICKNESS OF THE 22 SECTION WHEN YOU USE RUBBERIZED AC COMPARED TO THE 23 CONVENTIONAL AC.

24

ADDITIONALLY, MOST OF THE TIME

- 1 LITTLE TECHNICAL. IT'S BASICALLY A REINFORCING
- 2 FABRIC THAT PREVENTS CRACKING FROM COMING THROUGH,
 - 3 WHICH RUBBERIZED AC DOES ON ITS OWN. SO YOU
 - 4 ELIMINATE THE FABRIC, REDUCE THE STRUCTURAL
 - 5 SECTION, AND IT'S CLOSE. BUT WHAT NEEDS TO PUT

IT

- 6 OVER THE EDGE, AND I'M SERIOUS ABOUT THIS, IS
- 7 THESE NEW TECHNOLOGIES.
- 8 A COMPANY LIKE MINE, I'VE SPENT A
- 9 TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF RESEARCH WITH OUR OWN

MONEY

- 10 TO DEVELOP THIS PRODUCT. AND WHEN I TRY TO MARKET
- 11 IT IN A LOT OF THE CITIES, AGAIN, THE LACK OF
- 12 CREDIBILITY FROM COMING FROM A CONTRACTOR AND

IN

13 LIEU OF SOMEONE SAYING, WELL, LET'S SEE HOW

THIS

14 PERFORMS 20 YEARS DOWN THE ROAD, THE TECHNOLOGY

TO

EQUIPMENT,

- 15 STUDY THESE MATERIALS, ACCELERATE THE AGING,
- 16 PREDICT PERFORMANCE, THINGS LIKE THAT, WHERE I
- 17 DON'T HAVE ABILITY TO HAVE THAT KIND OF

| 18 | EVEN NOT VERY MUCH AROUND, IT'S NEEDED TO SHOW |
|--------|---|
| 19 | THAT THESE OTHER TECHNOLOGIES CAN PRODUCE |
| 20 | COST-EFFECTIVE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT CONCRETE AND, |
| 21 | THUS, BRING THE COST DOWN, WHICH WILL BE |
| 22 | COMPARABLE TO CONVENTIONAL. THAT'S WHAT I |
| THINK | |
| 23 | IS NEEDED. |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN RELIS: I WOULD MAYBE, |
| CAREN, | |

DO YOU WANT TO COMMENT ON THAT?

1 MS. TRGOVCICH: JUST TO RAISE FOR JUST 2 THE COMMITTEE'S CONSIDERATION, AT LAST MONTH'S 3 COMMITTEE WHERE WE WERE DISCUSSING THIS PROPOSAL, WE WERE FOCUSING ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. AND I 4 5 THINK THAT THIS GENTLEMAN, MR. SCHWARTZ, HAS 6 RAISED AN ASPECT OF THE PROPOSAL THAT WOULD EITHER 7 BE IN ADDITION TO OR SOMEHOW DIFFERENT FROM THE 8 CONCEPT THAT WE WERE DISCUSSING LAST MONTH AROUND 9 THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND BACK OUT TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OR COMMUNITIES THAT MAY NEED IT. 10 11 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO YOU THINK THIS IS --IF I FOLLOW, YOU'RE SAYING THIS IS MORE, WHAT, 12 13 R & D THAN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE? 14 MS. TRGOVCICH: WHAT WE DO ENVISION THE TYPE OF ASSISTANCE --15 CHAIRMAN RELIS: FROM WHAT WE'VE LEARNED, 16 17 ARE THERE DISTINCTIONS HERE? 18 MR. SCHWARTZ: IN MY PERSONAL COMPANY'S PERSPECTIVE, I'VE ALREADY DONE THE R & D. I NEED 19 20 THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO COMPARE THIS PROCESS 21 THAT I'M USING --22 MS. TRGOVCICH: IS THIS TESTING THEN? MR. SCHWARTZ: TESTING. 23 24 MEMBER PENNINGTON: EXCUSE ME. WHAT YOU 25 NEED IS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN MARKETING YOUR

1 PRODUCT. 2 MR. SCHWARTZ: NOT NECESSARILY MARKETING, 3 BUT PRESENTING THE DATA TO THE ASPHALT CONCRETE COMMUNITY FROM THE CREDIBILITY OF AN AGENCY AND 4 NOT FROM A PRODUCER TRYING TO SAY THIS IS THE 5 6 GREATEST THING IN THE WORLD. THERE'S A CERTAIN 7 CREDIBILITY THAT COMES FROM L.A. COUNTY BASED ON 8 THEIR WHOLE HISTORY OF BEING A LEADER IN RECYCLED 9 AC AND ASPHALT CONCRETE, THE TYPE OF PLANT INSPECTION THEY OFFER, EVERYTHING ABOUT THEM 10 THAT'S DIFFERENT FROM WHAT A CONTRACTOR CAN BRING 11 TO THE TABLE. 12 13 MEMBER GOTCH: LAST MONTH I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO MEET MR. SCHWARTZ AND SEE THE 14 15 FACILITY, THE NEW FACILITY IN IRVINE, AND IT WAS EXTREMELY IMPRESSIVE, FIRST OF ALL. NOTHING THAT 16 17 I EXPECTED IT TO BE. AND I'D LIKE TO ENCOURAGE 18 OTHER BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF TO VISIT THE FACILITY AS SOON AS THEY GET THE OPPORTUNITY. 19 20 BUT WHAT I LEARNED THROUGH THAT DAY 21 IS LITERALLY BY THE FLIP OF A SWITCH, YOU CAN GO 22 FROM TRADITIONAL ASPHALT TO RUBBERIZED ASPHALT IN 23 THE FACILITY. YOU HAVE THE CAPABILITY OF 24 RECYCLING ASPHALT THERE. AND THAT ALSO IN THAT --25 AT THAT TRIP I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY OF VISITING

- 1 LAGUNA NIGUEL AND WHAT THEY'RE DOING THERE. AND 2 THE APPLICATION IS HALF THE THICKNESS AND, 3 THEREFORE -- AND EXTENDS THE LIFE OF THE ASPHALT. AND, THEREFORE, THEY WERE GETTING MORE BANG FOR 4 5 THEIR BUCK AS FAR AS UTILIZATION OF ASPHALT 6 RUBBER. 7 MR. SCHWARTZ: THAT'S CORRECT. JUST TO 8 COMMENT ON WHAT JANET SAID, OUR COMPANY HAS 9 ALREADY DEVELOPED A TECHNOLOGY TO DO WHAT JANET IS SAYING, TO PRODUCE IT, CONVENIENTLY WITH OUR 10 11 NORMAL OPERATING PROCEDURES HANDLE THE MATERIAL IN 12 BULK, TAKE AWAY ALL THE EXCESS LABOR AND MOVING 13 THE EOUIPMENT IN AND OUT. BUT I DON'T NECESSARILY NEED A RESEARCH CENTER TO DEVELOP THE TECHNOLOGY 14 TO DO IT. I THINK THAT'S THE WHOLE IDEA IS TO 15 OPEN UP THE TECHNOLOGY CENTER TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE 16 17 WHO HAVE IDEAS LIKE ME TO BRING THEM TO A CENTRAL 18 AREA WHERE THESE PRODUCTS CAN BE STUDIED AND THAT 19 INFORMATION, BASED ON WHAT'S GATHERED, CAN BE PUT 20 OUT TO THE INDUSTRY TO GET AWAY FROM ALL THE 21 POLITICS OF WHAT MAKES A SUCCESSFUL PRODUCT OR 22 NONSUCCESSFUL PRODUCT, SO IT ALMOST ENCOURAGES NEW
- TECHNOLOGY.
- 24 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO YOU WANT TO TAKE

YOUR

25 KNOWLEDGE AND SHARE IT WITH YOUR COMPETITORS IN

1 THE PUBLIC ARENA? 2 MR. SCHWARTZ: I WANT THE USER AGENCIES 3 TO PUT IT INTO SPECIFICATIONS, NO. 1; AND, NO. 2, I WANT THE -- THERE'S SO MANY MISCONCEPTIONS OF 4 5 WHAT MAKES A SUCCESSFUL RUBBERIZED AC, HOW TO MEASURE THE PROPERTIES, ETC., AND THERE'S NO 6 7 COMMON GROUND. NO ONE -- THERE'S NO CENTRAL FOCUS 8 ON WHAT IS RIGHT AND WHAT IS WRONG. AND THAT'S A 9 MAJOR IMPEDING THE SUCCESS OF WIDESPREAD USAGE IN 10 MY OPINION. 11 MEMBER PENNINGTON: SO WOULD IT BE FAIR TO CHARACTERIZE THAT YOU'RE LOOKING FOR AN AVENUE 12 13 TO CREATE A STANDARD? 14 MR. SCHWARTZ: YES, IF I UNDERSTAND THAT. I WOULD LIKE THE AGENCIES TO GET AWAY FROM MORE OF 15 A RECIPE SPECIFICATION AND COME BACK WITH AN END 16 17 PRODUCT BASED ON TESTING, END PRODUCT PERFORMANCE 18 SPECIFICATION IN A CENTER THAT CAN PROVIDE WHAT THAT IS GOING TO BE AND HOW TO TEST IT AND 19 20 IMPLEMENT IT. 21 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 22 GORDON RAYNER, CALIFORNIA MAINTENANCE COMPANY.

MR. RAYNER: THAT'S CORRECT. IN FACT,

WE'RE JUST A COUPLE BLOCKS AWAY DOWN ON ELDER

YOU'RE LOCAL IN SACRAMENTO.

23

24

1 CREEK. NOW YOU HAVE TWO CONTRACTORS. WE ARE AN 2 END USER ALSO. AND I'M HERE TO SPEAK IN SUPPORT OF THE L.A. COUNTY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CENTER. 3 I'D LIKE TO GIVE YOU A SHORT 4 BACKGROUND ON WHY I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT. CPM HAS 5 6 BEEN WORKING IN RECYCLED MATERIALS SINCE 1990. 7 WE'VE WORKED WITH FIBERS, WE'VE WORKED WITH GLASS, 8 AND WE'VE WORKED WITH THE GROUND RUBBER. 9 OUR FIRST WORK IN THIS MATERIAL WAS TO HELP DESIGN MACHINERY THAT WOULD MANUFACTURE A 10 SHEARED RUBBER PROCESS FROM WHOLE TIRES. WE COULD 11 GET A GRADED RUBBER THAT WOULD WORK WITHIN THE 12 13 CURRENT SYSTEMS AND ALSO HAVE A SURFACE AREA THAT WE NEED TO MAKE IT BENEFICIAL TO ASPHALT. 14 ANOTHER KEY IMPORTANT ITEM HERE IS 15 16 THAT WE WERE LOOKING FOR RUBBER NOT AS A WAY TO 17 TAKE ADVANTAGE OF -- AT THAT TIME IT WASN'T VERY 18 POPULAR -- OF THE MONIES THAT MIGHT BE AVAILABLE, BUT RATHER THAN -- RATHER TO LOOK AT A PRODUCT 19 20 THAT WHERE THE RUBBER WOULD ACTUALLY ENHANCE THE 21 MATERIAL THAT WE WERE PLACING ON THE STREETS. 22 THAT HAS BEEN AND CONTINUES TO BE OUR GOAL. 23 WE ALSO BUILD THE EQUIPMENT THAT 24 MIXES AND PLACES THIS MATERIAL. WE SELL THIS

EQUIPMENT THROUGHOUT THE U.S., ALSO IN OTHER

1 COUNTRIES LIKE ARGENTINA, CHILE, CANADA, THAILAND. AND WE HAVE INTEREST IN ALL OF THOSE PLACES WITH 2 3 THE RUBBER PRODUCTS THAT WE ARE NOW PLACING. OVER THE YEARS WE'VE DEVELOPED 4 5 SYSTEMS THAT OVERCOME THE DRAWBACKS THAT WE'VE HAD 6 AND WE'VE FOUND IN THESE TYPE OF SYSTEMS. WE'VE 7 DEVELOPED TECHNOLOGY THAT IS ALLOWING US TO USE 8 THE RUBBER IN COMBINATION WITH ADDITIVES THAT 9 PRODUCE A PRODUCT THAT WILL GIVE LONGER LIFE AND IS THE -- TO THE BENEFIT OF SOMEONE TO TAKE A LOOK 10 AT, NOT JUST BECAUSE IT HAS RECYCLED MATERIAL IN 11 IT, BUT BECAUSE IT'S ACTUALLY A BETTER PRODUCT. 12 13 AND TO ANSWER THE OUESTION THAT I KNOW IS COMING, THIS IS NOT A PROPRIETARY PRODUCT. 14 THERE ARE SEVERAL PROPRIETARY PRODUCTS THAT ARE ON 15 16 THE MARKET, BUT THIS IS NOT ONE OF THEM. I'M HERE 17 TODAY TO SUPPORT THE FORMATION OF A TECHNOLOGY 18 TRANSFER CENTER BASICALLY FOR ALL THE SAME REASONS THAT LAST GENTLEMAN WAS TALKING ABOUT. 19 20 WHERE WE'VE SEEN THIS WORK AND WE'VE PLACED THIS FOR CITIES BACK ON CITY STREETS AS 21 22 EARLY AS '93 FOR THE CITY OF POMONA. WE KNOW THE 23 PRODUCT WORKS BECAUSE WE'VE BEEN DEALING IN THESE 24 TYPES OF MATERIALS FOR A LONG TIME. BUT AS THE

CONTRACTOR THAT ALSO PRODUCES THE MATERIAL, WE

1 FEEL IT'S IN THE BEST INTEREST TO FURTHER 2 RECYCLING METHODS TO HAVE SOMEONE WHO WOULD LOOK AT IT UNBIASED AS L.A. COUNTY WHO HAS TAKEN THE 3 LEAD IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FROM OUR POSITION 4 5 IN DEVELOPING THE USE OF RECYCLED MATERIALS IN 6 PAVEMENT SURFACES. 7 I THINK IT WOULD BE BENEFICIAL. 8 GET A LOT OF CALLS FROM CITIES AND AGENCIES NOW 9 WANTING TO KNOW ABOUT THE PRODUCT, THEY HEARD ABOUT IT, THEY'VE HEARD ABOUT DIFFERENT USES FOR 10 IT, AND THEY WANT TO SEE OTHER DATA THAT MAY HAVE 11 BEEN DONE BY AGENCIES. I CAN SAY FROM THE 12 13 EXPERIENCES I'VE HAD WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THEIR TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CENTERS, THAT HAS 14 15 BEEN VERY BENEFICIAL FOR THE STATES TO SHARE 16 INFORMATION ON THEIR EXPERIMENTS, THEIR USE OF 17 DIFFERENT PRODUCTS, AND MOVING THE TECHNOLOGY 18 AROUND. CPM IS WILLING TO SUPPORT THIS 19 20 EFFORT THROUGH THE USE OF TRAINING IN THE 21 PRODUCTS, FOR THE USE OF HELP TO WRITE 22 SPECIFICATIONS. AND SINCE WE'RE ONLY LOCATED A 23 COUPLE OF BLOCKS FROM HERE, IF ANYONE WOULD LIKE 24 TO VISIT OUR FACILITY, IT'S NOT A LOT TO SEE, 25 YOU'RE CERTAINLY WELCOME TO COME BY AND TALK

1 THESE ISSUES. ANY QUESTIONS I CAN ANSWER? 2 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I JUST THANK YOU FOR 3 COMING OUT BECAUSE IT'S HEARTENING TO HEAR NOW 4 FROM THE PEOPLE LAYING THE PRODUCT DOWN ON THE 5 ROAD AND GETTING VALIDATION THAT THERE IS A NEED б OUT THERE. 7 MR. RAYNER: WE FOUND THAT WE CAN, AS I 8 SAID IN THE BEGINNING, WE FOUND THAT WE CAN MAKE A PRODUCT THAT'S ACTUALLY BETTER THAN THE CURRENT 9 10 PRODUCT USING THE RECYCLED RUBBER SO THAT WE GAIN 11 THE FLEXIBILITY IN THE MATERIAL ALONG WITH 12 ADDITIONAL BINDERS WHICH ENHANCE THE BINDING OF THE RUBBER TO THE ASPHALT. IT'S A VERY GOOD 13 14 PRODUCT. 15 COST WAS BROUGHT UP BEFORE. WHEN 16 YOU ADD THESE MATERIALS INTO WHAT IS CURRENTLY 17 REFERRED TO AS A STANDARD SYSTEM, IT DOES INCREASE 18 THE COST, BUT THE PAYOFF IS THE BENEFIT OF THE 19 EXTENDED LIFE AND THE ABILITY TO USE THIS MATERIAL 20 IN AREAS WHERE IT CAN SERVICE THAT THE OTHERS 21 CAN'T. IN OTHER WORDS, WE CAN PLACE THIS MATERIAL 22 ON A ROADWAY THAT CANNOT BE REHABILITATED BY A 23 STANDARD SLURRY SEAL, AND THIS WILL MAKE 24 IMPROVEMENTS. 25 CHAIRMAN RELIS: COULD I ASK WHY THAT IS?

1 MR. RAYNER: IT'S PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF 2 THE FLEXIBILITY AND THE ADDITIONAL BINDERS THAT WE 3 PLACE IN THERE THAT WE GO THROUGH LOOKING AT EXPANSION PROCESSES AND THE THERMAL CHANGES THAT 4 5 WE GET DURING COST CYCLES. 6 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO ARE YOU SAYING THAT 7 BECAUSE OF THE FLEXIBILITY OF THE MATERIAL AS ONE PARAMETER, YOU CAN ACHIEVE EITHER REPAIRS THAT YOU 8 9 COULD NOT DO WITH STANDARD MATERIALS. 10 MR. RAYNER: THAT'S CORRECT. THAT'S CORRECT. NOT AS APPLICABLE IN CALIFORNIA EXCEPT 11 AT HIGH ELEVATIONS. BUT, FOR INSTANCE, IN THE 12 13 CITY OF RENO ON A PRIVATE PARKING LOT, WE FILLED CRACKS IN, I BELIEVE, 1993 WITH THIS MATERIAL, 14 WHICH IS NOT RECOGNIZED -- SLURRY SEAL IS NOT 15 16 RECOGNIZED AS A CRACK FILLING MATERIAL FOR WIDE 17 CRACKS. WE WERE FILLING CRACKS THAT WERE AN INCH 18 OR LARGER, AND THE MATERIAL PERFORMED AS WELL AS THE BEST HOT RUBBER CRACK FILLER THAT'S ON THE 19 20 MARKET TODAY. SO WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO TAKE A 21 PRODUCT THAT HAD NOT BEEN USED FOR SOMETHING AND 22 THEN USE IT FOR THAT TYPE OF SERVICE. 23 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 24 ANY QUESTIONS?

MEMBER PENNINGTON: YEAH. WHERE DO YOU

1 GET YOUR RUBBER? 2 MR. RAYNER: WE'VE BOUGHT IT FROM SEVERAL 3 SOURCES. 4 MEMBER PENNINGTON: CRUMB RUBBER. MR. RAYNER: YES. FROM TRISTATE WHEN 5 6 THEY WERE DEVELOPING THE MACHINES THAT DO THE 7 SHEARING, WORKING ON THE VARIOUS GRADED PRODUCTS, 8 BUT ALSO SOURCES IN L.A., BUT TYPICALLY HERE IN 9 CALIFORNIA. MEMBER PENNINGTON: WHAT ABOUT THE 10 11 QUALITY OF THE TIRE? 12 MR. RAYNER: WE NEED QUALITY IN THE AREAS 13 OF GRADATION AND IN CLEANLINESS OF THE RUBBER. WE CAN'T USE A SHREDDED MATERIAL BECAUSE OF THE 14 UNPREDICTABILITY OF THE SURFACE AREA THAT WE HAVE 15 16 TO COAT WITH THE ASPHALT AND THE ADDITIVES, SO WE 17 DO NEED A CONSISTENT GRADATION TO WORK WITH. 18 MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY. THANK YOU. CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. WE HAVE A LAST 19 20 SPEAKER, AND I'D ASK IF ANYONE ELSE IN THE 21 AUDIENCE WANTS TO ADDRESS, WOULD YOU PLEASE FILL 22 OUT A SLIP AGAIN AND BRING IT FORWARD. BARRY 23 TAKALLOU IS REPRESENTING TAC ENGINEERING. I'M SORRY. I HAVE ONE OTHER, JOHN BENNETT FOLLOWING 24

25

AND THEN YOU, SIR.

1 DR. TAKALLOU: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN. 2 I WANT TO TALK ON BEHALF OF CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO 3 NOW, SHIFTING THE GEAR TO NORTHERN CALIFORNIA. AS YOU MAY RECALL, PROJECT WAS PARTIALLY FUNDED BY 4 THE BOARD LAST YEAR FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 5 6 CLOSED LOOP RECYCLING PROGRAM FOR CITY OF SAN 7 FRANCISCO. WE HAVE STARTED THE PROJECT, AND NEWS 8 IS WE GET VERY GOOD COOPERATION FROM THE CITY. 9 YOU KNOW, THERE'S SO MUCH WORK FROM L.A. COUNTY. ALSO COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, THEY'RE GETTING VERY 10 MUCH INTERESTED TO ASPHALT RUBBER PROGRAM. 11 12 AS A MATTER OF FACT, NEXT WEEK WE GOING TO HAVE SOME TEST RUNS IN SAN FRANCISCO, AND 13 THEY GOING TO USE THEIR OWN ASPHALT PLANT. 14 THIS IS A CITY-OWNED ASPHALT PLANT. THEY GOING TO 15 16 INCORPORATE CRUMB RUBBER INTO THE ASPHALT PLANT. 17 AND AS FAR AS SOME OF THE CONCERNS 18 OF WHAT HAPPENS IF OXFORD ENERGY NO LONGER ACCEPT TIRES, THE GOOD NEWS IS THE LOCAL MARKETS ALREADY 19 20 MOVING IN, AND THAT ONE OF THAT LOCAL MARKET IS 21 GOING TO BE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT. SOME OF THE 22 INITIAL INDICATION WE HAVE, IT SHOWS THE PROGRAM 23 IN THE BAY AREA CAN CONSUME UP TO FOUR MILLION 24 TIRES AT THIS TIME TO GO TO THE RUBBERIZED ASPHALT

25

PROGRAM.

1 CHAIRMAN RELIS: FOUR MILLION A YEAR? 2 DR. TAKALLOU: THAT'S RIGHT. AND IN CASE 3 OF CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ACTUALLY GOING TO BE A LOT LESS. IT'S GOTTEN MORE ECONOMICAL BECAUSE 4 5 THEY HAVE THEIR OWN ASPHALT PLANT. THEY DON'T 6 HAVE TO CONTRACT IT OUT. AND THIS PROJECT WAS 7 PARTIALLY FUNDED. WE TAKE IT AS FAR AS THE 8 FUNDING ALLOWS US TO DO, BUT THERE IS A GREAT 9 INTEREST ON BEHALF OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE BAY AREA ALSO INTO ASPHALT RUBBER. AND ALSO FIRST 10 11 STEP WE'RE TAKING IN TWO WEEKS' TIME, THE 12 TECHNICAL PEOPLE FROM SAN FRANCISCO TO L.A. 13 COUNTY. 14 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO SAN FRANCISCO IS WILLING TO TAKE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM L.A.? 15 DR. TAKALLOU: THEY ARE COMING DOWN TO 16 17 L.A. TO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. 18 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I HAD TO SAY THAT. DR. TAKALLOU: IT'S A JOINT COOPERATION 19 20 WORK AND IS ALREADY -- L.A. COUNTY HAS PROPOSED, 21 BUT, AS I SAID, THE PROJECT IS PARTIALLY FUNDED. 22 AND ONE OF THE AREAS WHICH IS NOT FUNDED IS GOING 23 TO HELP THEM TO GET --24 MEMBER GOTCH: I WAS TRYING TO REMEMBER, 25 WE WERE DISCUSSING THIS YESTERDAY WITH STAFF, YOU

1 HAD ORIGINALLY REQUESTED HOW MUCH? YOU SAID 2 PARTIALLY FUNDED, AND YOU RECEIVED WHAT AMOUNT? 3 DR. TAKALLOU: \$38,618. MEMBER GOTCH: IS WHAT YOU HAD RECEIVED? 4 5 DR. TAKALLOU: THAT'S RIGHT. 6 MEMBER GOTCH: AND THE REQUEST WAS FOR? 7 DR. TAKALLOU: THE REQUEST FOR \$97,750. 8 MEMBER GOTCH: THANK YOU. 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. DOES ANYONE ELSE WISH TO ADDRESS -- I'M SORRY. YES. WE HAVE TWO, 10 JOHN BENNETT, WHO I REFERENCED EARLIER. JOHN, 11 12 YOU'RE FIRST. AND THEN ED TOMEO. 13 MR. BENNETT: CHAIRMAN, BOARD MEMBERS, THANK YOU. I'M JOHN BENNETT. I'M SPEAKING ON 14 BEHALF OF THE CALIFORNIA CEMENT MANUFACTURERS 15 16 ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION. 17 I KNOW IT'S A COINCIDENCE THAT WE 18 GET AROUND TO DISCUSSING FUNDING ALLOCATIONS AS WE MOVE TOWARDS THE CHRISTMAS SEASON, BUT THERE DOES 19 20 SEEM TO BE SORT OF A HOLIDAY ATMOSPHERE THAT 21 SURROUNDS THE PARADE OF FOLKS THAT ARE ALWAYS HERE 22 WHENEVER I'M HERE TO TALK ON A SUBJECT, SO I GUESS 23 IT'S APPROPRIATE. 24 THERE'S AN INTERESTING JUXTA-

POSITION, I THINK, BETWEEN YOUR AGENDA ITEM NO. 2

1 AND NO. 4 BECAUSE LAST YEAR WE SPENT A FAIR AMOUNT 2 OF TIME WALKING THE HALLS OF THE CAPITOL IN 3 DISCUSSIONS WITH RESPECT TO 2108, AND THERE WAS A LOT OF INTEREST IN THE WAY GRANTS ARE PROVIDED AND 4 5 THE TYPES OF PROJECTS FOR WHICH EXPENDITURES ARE 6 MADE. AND I WANT TO REMIND US ALL THAT OUR GOAL 7 IN COMPLYING WITH THE ACT IS TO FIND WAYS TO DEAL 8 WITH THE LEGACY PILES AND WITH THE FRESH FLOW IN 9 THE MOST ECONOMIC WAY POSSIBLE. 10 AND ONE WAY TO DEAL WITH THAT, OF COURSE, IS TO LOOK VERY CLOSELY AT THE GRANTS THAT 11 12 WE PROVIDE HERE IN THIS AGENCY BECAUSE WE'VE 13 CERTAINLY BEEN A PART OF THE ONGOING DISCUSSIONS WITH RESPECT TO THIS. SPECIFICALLY, THERE'S AN 14 ITEM OF A HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS WHICH HAS BEEN 15 16 OFFERED TO THE CEMENT INDUSTRY IN SUPPORT AND 17 TESTING AND SO ON AND SO FORTH. 18 THIS CONCERNS ME, FIRST, IN RESPECT TO THERE'S BEEN NO IDENTIFIED SPECIFIC NEED ON 19 20 BEHALF OF THE INDUSTRY WITH RESPECT TO EXPENDITURE 21 OF THESE FUNDS. AND, SECOND, WE DON'T THINK IT 22 COSTS A HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS TO DO WHAT'S 23 REALLY NECESSARY, AND THAT'S TO GET STAFF DOWN TO 24 THE PUBLIC HEARINGS AND TO THE LOCAL DISCUSSIONS 25 THAT ARE GOING ON AND MAKE PEOPLE UNDERSTAND THE

- 1 IMPORTANCE OF THE OPTIONS THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO
- 2 US, ONE OF WHICH IS TO USE WHOLE TIRES AND

CHIPPED

3 TIRES IN CEMENT KILNS WITHOUT HAVING TO SHELL

OUT

- 4 GRANTS, WITHOUT HAVING TO PROP UP INDUSTRIES,
- 5 WITHOUT HAVING TO MOVE INTO THIS AREA THAT WE

CALL

- 6 MARKET DEVELOPMENT.
- 7 BUT WE'RE, AS I SAID, CONCERNED
- 8 ABOUT ANOTHER GRANT WITH RESPECT TO THE CEMENT
- 9 INDUSTRY, AND WE NEED TO EXPRESS OUR CONCERN

ABOUT

10 TIGHTER CONTROLS OVER THOSE GRANTS. AS WE'VE

SEEN

- 11 TODAY, THERE MAY BE OTHER BETTER WAYS TO MOVE
- 12 AHEAD IN MORE A CONTRACTUAL BASIS. BUT AS WE

MOVE

- 13 AHEAD NEXT YEAR WITH SOME OF THESE LEGISLATIVE
- 14 PROPOSALS OR IN THE YEAR AFTER THAT, I THINK WE
- 15 ALL NEED TO LOOK CAREFULLY ABOUT HOW THOSE

GRANTS

ARE PROVIDED AND TRY AND DO MORE WITH LESS.

WE'LL

17 CERTAINLY TRY TO PARTICIPATE AND BE SUPPORTIVE

| IN | |
|------------------|---|
| 18 | ANY EFFORT TO DO THAT. THANK YOU. |
| 19 | MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D |
| 20 | LIKE TO THANK MR. BENNETT FOR BEING WILLING TO |
| 21 | HAVE US REIGN WITH A TIGHT HAND. AND I AGREE |
| WITH | |
| 22 | YOU, AND THAT'S WHY I'VE CUT IN MY PROPOSAL |
| CUT | |
| 23 | THAT PARTICULAR GRANT DOWN. WE APPRECIATE YOU |
| 24 25 JUST | COMING AND TELLING US THAT. MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, MAYBE |

- 1 FOR THE BENEFIT OF THOSE IN THE AUDIENCE AND MR.
- 2 BENNETT, PART OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET ACT
- 3 LANGUAGE REQUIRES US TO BEGIN AND CONDUCT AN
- 4 EVALUATION OF THE GRANTS THAT WE HAVE OFFERED
- 5 LOOKING AT WHERE THEY'VE BEEN MOST EFFECTIVE AND
- 6 MAKING SOME RECOMMENDATIONS. AND WE ARE IN THE
- 7 PROCESS OF DEVELOPING THAT REPORT AT THIS TIME,
- 8 AND SO YOU WILL BE HEARING MORE ABOUT THAT IN THE
- 9 COMING MONTHS.
- 10 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THANK YOU. OKAY. ED
- 11 TOMEO.
- 12 MR. TOMEO: I FELT IT WAS IMPERATIVE

THAT

- 13 I COME BACK AND BASICALLY OFFER A RESPONSE, I
- 14 GUESS, TO MICHAEL BRYNE'S OBSERVATIONS OR

COMMENTS

- 15 THAT WERE PROVIDED TO YOU ON BEHALF OF HIS CLIENT,
- OXFORD TIRE. FUNDAMENTALLY I ALLUDED TO IT AT

THE

- 17 LAST COMMITTEE MEETING, THAT THERE HAS BEEN A
- 18 CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP CHANGE BETWEEN US AND
- 19 OXFORD TIRE RECYCLING.
- 20 AND SO WITH REGARD TO MICHAEL'S
- 21 COMMENTS, THE PART I DO AGREE WITH IS EXPEDIENCE.

| 22 | I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO WORK WITH THE BOARD IN HASTE |
|------------------|---|
| 23 | TO DO WHAT WE CAN TO IMPROVE THE SITUATION WHICH |
| 24 25 THAT | WE CURRENTLY HAVE. THAT SITUATION IS FUNDAMENTALLY |

WE ARE CONTINUING TO RECEIVE AND ACCEPT OXFORD

1

TIRE RECYCLING TIRES AT OUR FACILITY; HOWEVER, WE 2 3 ARE NOT BEING PAID FOR THOSE TIRES. THAT IS IN 4 BREACH OF THE CONTRACT THAT WE HAVE WITH THEM. 5 AND ALTHOUGH I DON'T HAVE THE EXACT FIGURE RIGHT 6 NOW, WE ARE SOMEWHERE IN ARREARS OF \$400,000, 7 WHICH IS BASICALLY MONEY THAT IS NOT GOING TO BE 8 PAYING DEBT. 9 WE ARE, AS A RESULT, CURRENTLY OUT 10 ON THE MARKETPLACE SOLICITING BIDS FROM OTHER TIRE 11 SUPPLIERS AND HAVE RECEIVED A NUMBER OF RESPONSES 12 AND HOPE TO HAVE A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH A NEW TIRE SUPPLIER IN THE NEAR FUTURE. BASICALLY IT'S 13 14 IMPORTANT, AS WE DISCUSSED EARLIER, THAT MODESTO DOES RECEIVE MONEY FOR TIRES. IT'S CERTAINLY A 15 CLEAR COMPONENT OF OUR FINANCIAL SECURITY. 16 17 BASICALLY WE HAVE ALSO DISCUSSED THE LONG-TERM VIABILITY OF THIS FACILITY, AND AS FAR 18 AS I'M CONCERNED, THERE ARE THREE MAIN COMPONENTS. 19 20 ONE, WHICH WE HAVE A LOT OF CONTROL OVER, IS THE COST REDUCTION PROGRAM AT THIS FACILITY. AND U.E. 21 22 ENERGY IN THEIR MANAGEMENT OF THIS FACILITY HAS 23 REDUCED EXPENSES BY OVER A MILLION AND A HALF DOLLARS PER YEAR OVER THE PERIOD OF TIME THAT 24 WE

THE SECOND IMPORTANT COMPONENT IS 1 TIRE TIP FEES. AND WE ARE LOOKING TO A 2 3 MARKETPLACE WHERE WE CAN GET HIGHER TIP FEES 4 PERHAPS ON THE OPEN MARKET COMPONENT, BUT ALSO 5 THERE WAS A DISCUSSION ABOUT LEGISLATIVE б INITIATIVE THIS MORNING, AND WE DO INTEND TO 7 PURSUE AGAIN, HOPEFULLY IN CONJUNCTION WITH A 8 NUMBER OF PARTIES IN THIS ROOM, A LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVE TO GET THE FEE FOR TIRE DISPOSAL AT 9 10 THE -- ACTUALLY A PAYMENT AT THE POINT OF 11 CONSUMPTION OF A NEW TIRE A DOLLAR FEE TO BE USED 12 TO PAY END USERS FOR THE CONSUMPTION OF THAT TIRE. WE THINK THAT'S A VERY IMPORTANT COMPONENT IN 13 14 STIMULATING THE MARKETPLACE. 15 YOU DO RECOGNIZE THAT MODESTO IS CURRENTLY CONSUMING ONE-THIRD OF ALL THE TIRES 16 17 THAT ARE BEING REUSED IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. 18 HOWEVER, THERE'S STILL ANOTHER TEN MILLION TO GO. AND IF WE LOSE OUR FACILITY, YOU PUT THE 10 19 20 MILLION OUT THERE AND OUR SIX MILLION ON TOP OF 21 IT, YOU STILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT TIRE PROBLEM. 22 FINALLY, THE OTHER REVENUE COMPONENT 23 IS ELECTRIC REVENUES, AND WE WILL CONTINUE TO WORK 2.4 THROUGH THE ELECTRIC INDUSTRY RESTRUCTURING TO TRY

AND SECURE ADDITIONAL REVENUES IN THAT FRONT AND

- 1 ALSO PLAN TO WORK WITH PG&E IN DISCUSSING OUR
- 2 CURRENT DILEMMA.
- 3 ALSO, I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE
- 4 WHY WE ARE CONTINUING TO RECEIVE TIRES FROM OTR
- 5 AND BURN THEM. YOU HAVE TO RECOGNIZE THEY ARE
- 6 TIRES OFF THE ROAD, AND THEY ARE, THEREFORE, NOT
- 7 TIRES THAT WE'RE BURNING FROM THE PILE. THE PILE
- 8 IS REMAINING APPROXIMATELY THE SAME SIZE. WE BURN
- 9 500,000 TIRES A MONTH AND WE'RE LOSING VALUABLE
- 10 TIME. THANK YOU.
- 11 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I SUGGEST AT THIS POINT
- 12 WE TAKE OUR LUNCH BREAK BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO NOW
- 13 PROCEED INTO THE BUDGET EXPENDITURE DELIBERATIONS
- 14 THAT WILL TAKE A WHILE, SO THERE'S NO POINT
- 15 BEGINNING THAT RIGHT NOW. SO IF THE COMMITTEE
- 16 MEMBERS ARE IN AGREEMENT, I WOULD SUGGEST WE
- 17 RESUME AT ONE. WE HAVE AN HOUR AND 15 MINUTES.
- 18 IS THAT ENOUGH TIME? 1:15.
- 19 MEMBER GOTCH: THAT'S FINE. I HAVE A
- 20 1:30 ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE.
- 21 MEMBER PENNINGTON: AS CHAIR, WE CAN MOVE
- 22 THAT TO LATER IN THE DAY. I KNOW YOU HAVE TO GET
- OUT OF HERE.
- 24 MEMBER GOTCH: NO, THAT'S FINE.
- 25 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO WE HAVE THE PARTIES

TO MAINTAIN FLEXIBILITY. OKAY. 1:15 THEN. 1 2 (RECESS TAKEN.) 3 CHAIRMAN RELIS: CALL BACK TO ORDER THE MEETING OF THE POLICY, RESEARCH, AND TECHNICAL 4 5 ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE. 6 MEMBER GOTCH: MR. CHAIRMAN, I'D LIKE TO 7 CLARIFY, THIS IS WHAT WE WERE JUST DISCUSSING, WAS 8 THE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS THAT WE HAD DISCUSSED 9 EARLIER, AND THE MOTION WAS TO BRING THOSE TO, IN MY UNDERSTANDING, BRING THOSE ALL TO LEGISLATION 10 COMMITTEE. ACTUALLY, I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S WHAT 11 YOU AGREED TO ALSO. THAT'S WHAT I THOUGHT YOU HAD 12 UNDERSTOOD IT THAT WAY. AND ACTUALLY I'LL JUST 13 ASK DOROTHY. 14 MS. RICE: MAYBE I'M THE ONLY ONE 15 16 UNCLEAR. I HAD UNDERSTOOD WHEN YOU REFERRED TO 17 BRINGING THEM BACK THROUGH THE ORDINARY PROCESS, 18 NOT GENERALLY A COMMITTEE ITEM IN PUBLIC, BUT INFORMALLY BY STAFF ON THE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS. 19 20 BUT IF IT IS THE PREFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE TO 21 HAVE AN EXCEPTION TO THAT PROCESS AND BRING THE 22 TIRE PROPOSALS FORMALLY TO THE LEGISLATION 23 COMMITTEE, WE CAN CERTAINLY DO THAT IF THAT'S THE 24 WISH OF THE COMMITTEE, EXCEPTING THOSE THAT HAVE

ALREADY BEEN APPROVED BY THE BOARD MEMBERS THROUGH

- 1 THE USUAL INFORMAL PROCESS. IN OTHER WORDS, YOU
- 2 ALREADY HAVE A TIRE PROPOSAL IN, WHICH INCLUDES, I
- 3 BELIEVE, FOUR OF THE ELEMENTS OF WHAT WERE
- 4 DISCUSSED TODAY, SO THOSE HAVE ALREADY RECEIVED
- 5 YOUR APPROVAL TO PROCEED WITH.
- 6 MEMBER GOTCH: AND THERE WERE SEVERAL
- 7 THAT I WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT WE BROUGHT UP,
- 8 SPECIFICALLY NO. 3, WHICH WAS THE INCREASED AMOUNT
- 9 OF TIRE FUND FEE FROM 25 CENTS PER TIRE TO A
- 10 DOLLAR PER TIRE. SO THE ONES THAT HAVE ALREADY
- 11 BEEN BROUGHT UP TO THE BOARD'S -- THROUGH THE
- 12 BOARD ARE 1, 5, 6 AND 7.
- MS. RICE: THAT'S CORRECT.
- 14 MEMBER GOTCH: THE REMAINDER IS WHAT I'D
- 15 LIKE TO BRING TO LEGISLATION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION
- 16 COMMITTEE.
- 17 MEMBER PENNINGTON: AFTER WE DO OUR
- 18 INFORMAL STUFF. WE CAN WORK ON THAT.
- 19 MEMBER GOTCH: INFORMALLY DISCUSSING?
- 20 MEMBER PENNINGTON: RIGHT. I MEAN OUR
- 21 PROCESS IS USUALLY TO GO FROM BOARD OFFICE TO
- 22 BOARD OFFICE AND --
- MS. RICE: I'M ASSUMING YOU WOULD BE
- 24 REPLACING THAT PROCESS WITH BRINGING THEM TO
- 25 COMMITTEE.

1 MEMBER PENNINGTON: I THINK WE WANT -- I 2 THINK WE NEED TO HAVE LAID OUT FOR US WHAT THE 3 PROPOSAL IS BEFORE WE WANT TO TAKE IT FORMALLY TO 4 COMMITTEE. 5 MS. RICE: SO WE WILL DEVELOP THE 6 PROPOSALS MORE FULLY AND PROVIDE THAT INFORMATION 7 TO YOUR OFFICES AND CALENDAR AN ITEM FOR THE 8 LEGISLATION COMMITTEE. 9 MEMBER GOTCH: DECEMBER LEGISLATION 10 COMMITTEE. 11 CHAIRMAN RELIS: IS THAT PERFECTLY CLEAR? MS. RICE: YES, THANK YOU. 12 13 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. THERE ARE EX PARTES DURING THE RECESS. 14 MEMBER GOTCH: YES, MR. CHAIR, THANK YOU. 15 16 I HAD A CONVERSATION WITH MICHAEL HARRINGTON WITH 17 BAS REGARDING THE PLAYGROUND TILES AND A TOUR OF 18 HIS FACILITY. BRIEF DISCUSSION WITH DR. BARRY TAKALLOU REGARDING SAN FRANCISCO GRANT MONEY, AND 19 20 TERRY LEVEILLE REGARDING LEGISLATION PROPOSALS. 21 ALSO, THE LETTER, THE CCMEC THAT YOU HEARD EARLIER 22 EX PARTED. THANK YOU. 23 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I HAD RUN INTO MICHAEL

BRYNE IN THE HALLWAY REGARDING THE MELP/OXFORD

24

25

MATTER.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: I SPOKE WITH MICHAEL 1 2 BRYNE ABOUT GOLF. 3 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. WE HAVE COMPLETED 4 THE PUBLIC TESTIMONY. AND WE ARE NOW INTO THE 5 ALLOCATION DISCUSSIONS. DOES STAFF HAVE ANYTHING 6 TO ADD BEFORE WE BEGIN OUR DELIBERATIONS ON THIS? 7 MS. RICE: NO. AS I INDICATED EARLIER, WE MAY CERTAINLY HAVE QUESTIONS OR SEEK 8 9 CLARIFICATIONS ON YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS AS YOU 10 DEVELOP THEM. 11 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. 12 MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO LEAD OFF WITH THIS? 13 14 CHAIRMAN RELIS: WELL, IF I COULD JUST 15 SAY A COUPLE, USING CHAIR'S PREROGATIVE, A FEW 16 OVERARCHING STATEMENTS. FIRST OF ALL, JUST 17 REGARDING AT THE OUTSET WE HEARD A BRIEF REPORT FROM MR. CHANDLER ON THE MELP/OTR/CPCFA INTERFACE. 18 19 AND I JUST WANTED TO CONVEY THAT I THINK THIS 20 ISSUE WARRANTS SPECIAL CONSIDERATION FOR A NUMBER 2.1 OF REASONS. 22 ONE IS THAT WE DEPEND NOW ON THIS 23 OPERATION FOR FIVE TO SIX MILLION TIRES AS PART OF 2.4 THE CURRENT MARKET. AND I KNOW THAT'S BEEN STATED

A NUMBER OF TIMES, BUT I DON'T THINK THAT CAN BE

- 1 OVERSTATED ALONG WITH THE SCALE OF THE LEGACY PILE 2 THAT IS THERE. AND I REALIZE THIS IS VERY COMPLEX 3 AND IT SEE-SAWS BACK AND FORTH, AND THERE ARE A NUMBER OF PARTIES, BUT IT WOULD BE MY HOPE TODAY 4 5 THAT WE WOULD MAKE A COMMITMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN 6 SOME MANNER IN TRYING TO RESOLVE THIS TO PRESERVE 7 THE BOARD'S OPTION OF HAVING A MARKET FOR THOSE 8 TIRES. 9 AND SO I JUST WANTED TO OFFER A PERSPECTIVE ON THAT BECAUSE I THINK THAT ISSUE IS 10 11 ONE VERY MUCH OF STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE FOR OUR 12 WHOLE PROGRAM FOR WHAT WE CAN DO IN THE NEAR TERM 13 AND WHETHER WE'RE MOVING FORWARD OR BACKWARDS ON THIS. SO I'LL STOP THERE. 14 15 MEMBER GOTCH: MR. CHAIRMAN, I HAVE A 16 COUPLE OF QUESTIONS. I GUESS I'D LIKE TO, FIRST 17 OF ALL, WHY IS THE \$500,000 RESERVE THE AMOUNT? 18 WHY THE SACRED NUMBER? AND WHY IN THIS CURRENT
- MR. CHANDLER: LET ME ANSWER YOUR SECOND

 OUESTION FIRST, IF I COULD. IT'S A TIMING

YEAR ALSO? NEXT YEAR WE WILL HAVE MORE FUNDS

- QUESTION. IT'S MY BELIEF THAT IF WE'RE GOING TO
- 24 TRY TO SIT DOWN WITH THE PARTIES INVOLVED.

AVAILABLE AND...

19

20

25 INCLUDING THE OTHER STATE AGENCIES, FINANCING

1 AUTHORITY, THAT WE NEED TO DO THAT IMMEDIATELY. 2 TO POSTPONE DISCUSSIONS UNTIL THE JULY/AUGUST TIME 3 FRAME OF NEXT YEAR, AND LET'S ACKNOWLEDGE THAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR FUNDING DIRECTION FOR CURRENT 4 YEAR IN THE NOVEMBER TIME FRAME NOW. 5 6 SO IF WE PRESUME THAT WE'RE GOING TO 7 BE ON THIS SAME TRACK NEXT YEAR, WE'LL BE IN HERE IN THE NOVEMBER CALENDAR 1997 LOOKING AT 8 9 ALLOCATING 7-8 DOLLARS. 10 THE ISSUE THAT IS FACING THE TIRE PILE AS WELL AS FACING THE ENERGY FACILITY OUT 11 12 THERE IS ONE IN WHICH IS EXACERBATED BY THE CLIFF 13 DATE OF SEPTEMBER '97. SO IT WAS MY BELIEF THAT IF WE COULD SIT DOWN AND BEGIN NEGOTIATIONS 14 IMMEDIATELY WITH ALL THE PARTIES INVOLVED, 15 INCLUDING THE BANKS, POSSIBLY PG&E, THAT WE COULD 16 17 PERHAPS STRUCTURE A SITUATION OUT THERE THAT WORKS FOR THE STATE'S LONG-TERM BEST INTEREST. 18 19 I FEEL THAT IN ORDER TO BE AT THE 20 TABLE AND HAVE THAT KIND OF NEGOTIATIONS, TO SIMPLY BE THERE WITH ALL OF OUR DOLLARS ALLOCATED 21 22 IN OTHER DIRECTIONS PUTS US IN THIS WEAK BARGAINING POSITION AT BEST, AND CERTAINLY 23

DOESN'T

24 PUT US IN A LEADERSHIP POSITION. SO I WAS

ARGUING

THAT WE AT LEAST PRESERVE THE STATE'S INTEREST

IMMEDIATELY BY HAVING, IF YOU WILL, OURSELVES AT 1 2 THE TABLE. 3 NOW, YOUR QUESTION ABOUT THE DOLLAR 4 AMOUNT, I CAME TO THE DOLLAR AMOUNT FRANKLY FROM 5 THE STAFF'S ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION, WHICH WAS, IF 6 I RECALL CORRECTLY, IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF ABOUT 7 750 TO 800 THAT WAS UNALLOCATED IN THE CURRENT 8 YEAR BUDGET. DO YOU RECALL, DOROTHY, HOW MUCH WE 9 HAD? MS. RICE: THAT WAS THE AMOUNT REMAINING 10 AFTER THE COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS OF LAST MONTH. 11 MR. CHANDLER: THAT'S CORRECT. THAT'S, I 12 13 GUESS, THE POINT OF REFERENCE I'M TRYING TO SPEAK TO IS AT THE LAST COMMITTEE MEETING BEFORE TODAY'S 14 MEETING, YOU HAD ON THE TABLE \$800,000 15 16 UNALLOCATED. AND I WAS HOPEFUL THAT THAT MONIES 17 COULD BE SET ASIDE AS PRIORITY SITES -- FOR 18 PRIORITY SITES. I SEE THAT SINCE THEN, THE ADVISORS 19 20 HAVE GOTTEN TOGETHER AND ALLOCATED A MUCH SMALLER 21 LEVEL, AND WE HAVE NO MONEY AT THIS POINT 22 UNALLOCATED. I WOULD STILL ARGUE THAT YOU NEED A 23 SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNT AVAILABLE TO ENTER INTO THOSE

KINDS OF NEGOTIATIONS. SO MY FIGURE WAS IN THE

NEIGHBORHOOD OF HALF A MILLION, 500,000. I'LL

24

- ADMIT TO YOU THAT THAT IS PURELY JUST A FIGURE
 THAT WE FELT WAS APPROPRIATE FOR US TO OPEN UP
 NEGOTIATIONS.
- MEMBER GOTCH: I HAVE NOT BEEN BRIEFED BY

 YOU ON THIS ITEM YET, ALTHOUGH CAREN GAVE ME A

 LITTLE BACKGROUND IN THIS. AND I HAVE SOME CAUSE

 FOR CONCERN WITH THAT AMOUNT AT THIS TIME WITH THE

 AMOUNT OF KNOWLEDGE THAT I HAVE AT THIS POINT. SO

 I WANT TO MAKE THE OTHER COMMITTEE MEMBERS AWARE
- 10 OF THIS.
- MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, PERHAPS IF

 12 I CAN JUST ALSO ADD THAT IN OUR DISCUSSIONS WITH
- 13 CPCFA, WE ASKED THAT VERY SAME QUESTION OF MR.
- 14 SEEGMILLER AS WELL, AND WE INDICATED THE RANGE OF
- 15 FUNDS THAT WERE UNALLOCATED. AND I THINK THAT
- 16 WE'RE -- THE DOLLAR AMOUNT THAT YOU'VE SEEN
- 17 PROPOSED BEFORE YOU CAME FROM AS WELL WAS THEIR
- 18 RECOGNITION OF THOSE UNALLOCATED FUNDS AND SAYING
- 19 THAT THAT WOULD BE A STARTING POINT. SO
- 20 RECOGNITION ON THEIR PART THAT A SIGNIFICANT
- 21 PORTION OF FUNDS WOULD BE NECESSARY.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RELIS: JUST TO CARRY FORWARD A
- 23 LITTLE FURTHER, IT WOULD BE MY HOPE THAT WE COULD
- 24 INTRODUCE THAT, TAKE IT -- IN OTHER WORDS, MOVE IT
- 25 AS AN ITEM THAT WE COULD ESTABLISH IN OUR

1 ALLOCATION THIS YEAR, BUT TO MAINTAIN BELOW THAT A 2 SEMBLANCE OF THE BALANCE THAT WE HAD DISCUSSED 3 EARLIER IN THE POLICY APPROACH, WHICH WAS TO SHARE THE MONIES BETWEEN MARKETS AND CLEANUP COST 4 5 DIRECTLY. 6 AND BECAUSE THAT REFLECTS -- I THINK 7 THE MELP ISSUE IS PART OF OUR MARKET. I MEAN IT'S 8 NOT JUST A CLEANUP. IT'S AN END USE. IT'S THE 9 WAY WE'RE LOOKING AT OTHER MARKETS AS WELL IN THIS WHOLE SCHEME OF POSSIBILITIES HERE. SO I JUST ADD 10 11 THAT. SO WE COULD PROCEED TO EITHER --12 13 WHAT'S THE PLEASURE OF THE COMMITTEE, GO THROUGH EACH ITEM, TAKE THIS ONE UP FIRST, OR GO THROUGH 14 15 THE WHOLE LIST ONE BY ONE LIKE WE HAD DONE LAST 16 TIME? 17 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YEAH. I'D BE 18 PREPARED TO GIVE YOU A LIST OF HOW I WOULD 19 APPROPRIATE THE MONEY, AND THEN WE CAN GO THROUGH 20 AND ARGUE ABOUT WHERE WE WOULD MAKE CHANGES, IF 21 YOU WISH TO DO SO. 22 MEMBER GOTCH: MR. CHAIR, IF I MAY, I'D LIKE TO ASK ANOTHER QUESTION, AND THAT IS THE 23

SECTION 27 MONIES WITH THE EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

AND IF WE GET THE AUTHORITY FOR THE ADDITIONAL

24

1 MONIES, I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE A CONTINGENCY PLAN OF HOW WE PLAN ON SPENDING THAT MONEY. HOW ARE WE 2 3 GOING TO SPEND THAT MONEY? 4 MR. CHANDLER: YEAH. THIS IS GOING TO 5 GET COMPLICATED, BUT BEAR WITH ME. I THINK I MAY б HAVE MISGUIDED THE BOARD A BIT ON THE NUMBERS. I 7 GAVE YOU A FIGURE OF 1.3 MILLION AND I COUPLED 8 THAT WITH \$750,000 THAT WE, AS YOU KNOW, CANCELED IN THE PREVIOUS CONTRACT LAST YEAR AND ABOUT 9 10 550,000 THAT I SAID WAS AVAILABLE DUE TO THE 11 MAZZONI BILL. 12 IT HAS SINCE BEEN POINTED OUT TO ME AND I WAS REMINDED BY ADMINISTRATION STAFF THAT 13 14 550,000 HAS ALREADY BEEN BUILT INTO OUR NEXT YEAR 15 BCP THAT HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF 16 FINANCE FOR 7-8 FISCAL YEAR. IN OTHER WORDS, I 17 WAS ASSUMING THAT THAT MONEY COULD BE PART OF THE 18 DEFICIENCY REOUEST, AND I THINK IT WOULD BE MORE 19 PRUDENT TO HOLD ON TO WHAT WE ALREADY HAVE 20 APPROVED AT THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE FOR 7-8, 21 WHICH IS THAT RECOGNITION THAT THE MAZZONI BILL IS 22 GOING TO BRING ADDITIONAL REVENUES IN CURRENT YEAR 23 AND BUILD IT INTO OUR SPENDING AUTHORITY FOR 7-8, 24 WHICH LEAVES, IF YOU WILL, ON THE TABLE FOR THE DEFICIENCY REQUEST SIMPLY THE AMOUNT THAT WAS 25

1

CANCELED IN THE PREVIOUS CONTRACT THE 750,000. 2 SO I WOULD TRY TO ANSWER YOUR 3 QUESTION ON HOW WE WERE GOING TO ALLOCATE THE DEFICIENCY REQUEST MONEY BY INDICATING THAT IT'S 4 5 BEEN MY IMPRESSION ALL ALONG THAT YOU WANT TO SEE THAT MONEY GO TOWARDS A CLEANUP EFFORT SIMILAR TO 6 7 THE ONE THAT WAS CANCELED SO THAT WE CAN KEEP 8 THOSE KINDS OF TIRE PILE CLEANUPS ONGOING 9 STATEWIDE. 10 MEMBER GOTCH: THANK YOU. 11 CHAIRMAN RELIS: MR. PENNINGTON, ARE YOU 12 GOING TO PRESENT A LIST? 13 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YES. MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, WOULD IT 14 HELP AND, BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON, IF WE 15 DISPLAYED 16 A CHART SHOWING JUST THE LINE ITEMS, NOT THE 17 DOLLAR AMOUNTS, BUT THE LINE ITEMS OF THE SUBJECT 18 AREAS? 19 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THAT WOULD HELP 20 EVERYBODY. 21 MEMBER PENNINGTON: I HAVE MORE. I'M 22 GOING TO START WITH THE PILOT LEA GRANT PROGRAM, \$200,000; HIGHWAY PATROL, \$100,000; DMV, 15,000; 23 24 STATEWIDE CLEANUP, 750; EMERGENCY FUND, 250;

LOCAL

GOVERNMENT CLEANUP MATCHING FUNDS GRANTS, 250;

```
1
      FIRE MARSHAL, 100,000.
 2
                    MARKETING DEVELOPMENT AREA, WE'D GO
 3
      LOCAL GOVERNMENT MATCHING GRANTS FOR PRODUCTS,
      500,000; STATE CENTER FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE,
 4
 5
      500,000; FINANCIAL SERVICES FOR 50,000; THE COAL
 6
      COGEN TESTING, 200; CEMENT KILNS INFORMATION,
 7
      PUBLIC RELATIONS, 50; LOANS, RMDZ-TYPE LOANS, 430.
 8
                     NOW, TO GET TO THE HALF A MILLION
 9
      DOLLARS RESERVE THAT WE'D LIKE TO HAVE, I WOULD
      PROPOSE THAT WE TAKE -- THAT WE ZERO OUT THE
10
      EMERGENCY FUND OF 250,000 IN THE PERMITTING AND
11
12
      ENFORCEMENT, AND WE REDUCE THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT
13
      MATCHING GRANTS FROM 500 TO 300; BUT INSTEAD OF
      HAVING IT A MORE WIDE OPEN, HAVE IT DIRECTED AT
14
      THE PLAYGROUND MATS, EITHER FROM LOCAL GOVERNMENT
15
      OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND TAKE 50,000 FROM THE RMDZ
16
17
      LOAN. THAT WOULD GIVE US HALF A MILLION DOLLARS
18
      IN RESERVE WHICH COULD BE ROLLED BACK INTO THESE
      PROGRAMS IF THE 500,000 IS NOT NEEDED.
19
20
                CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO HOW -- COULD I ASK:
21
      DO YOU HAVE THAT ADDED, THOSE COLUMNS, BECAUSE I'D
      JUST LIKE TO SEE WHAT THE DISTRIBUTION IS BETWEEN
22
23
      CLEANUP AND MARKETS, JUST BROADLY.
24
               MEMBER PENNINGTON:
                                    WELL, LET'S SEE.
25
      MARKETS YOU'VE GOT 500, GOT 300, GOT 800, A
```

1 MILLION, A MILLION ONE, AND A MILLION 480,000, AND 2 IN PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT YOU HAVE A MILLION TWO HUNDRED -- I MEAN A MILLION 400 --3 4 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO IT'S BALANCED. MEMBER PENNINGTON: IT'S BASICALLY 5 BALANCED. 6 7 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. WELL, 8 IT'S OUT ON THE TABLE. 9 MEMBER PENNINGTON: AT LEAST THAT'S THE WAY IT IS IN MY COMPUTER-LIKE MIND. 10 11 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. SO WE HAVE A PROPOSAL. LET'S DISCUSS THIS. 12 13 MEMBER GOTCH: QUESTION. THE RMDZ LOANS, HOW DID WE ARRIVE AT THIS AMOUNT, WHICH WAS 14 15 \$430,000? MEMBER PENNINGTON: HOW DID THEY GET TO 16 17 370? 18 MEMBER GOTCH: WAS THAT A SPECIFIC NUMBER 19 THAT WAS --20 MEMBER PENNINGTON: THAT'S A NUMBER THAT 21 WAS TAKEN AFTER THE ADVISORS AND AFTER WE HAD 22 FUNDED THE OTHER THINGS THAT WE FELT WE NEEDED, 23 THAT WAS WHAT WAS LEFT. AND WE FELT AND I KNEW

THAT THAT WAS AN AREA THAT MR. CHESBRO WAS

INTERESTED IN, AND WE FELT WE WANTED TO HONOR

24

THAT

1 COMMITMENT THAT HE AND I HAD DISCUSSED EARLIER. MEMBER GOTCH: I WOULD, IF I MAY, ALSO 2 3 LIKE TO SEPARATE THE RAC GRANTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND SCHOOL LOCAL PLAYGROUNDS. 4 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SEPARATE THEM? YOU MEAN 5 UNDER THE GRANTS -- OKAY. YOU ARE TALKING TWO 6 7 CATEGORIES, GRANTS AND RAC --8 MEMBER GOTCH: TWO CATEGORIES, THAT'S 9 CORRECT. CHAIRMAN RELIS: AND WHAT WE'RE 10 11 CALLING --12 MEMBER GOTCH: SCHOOLS, LOCAL --13 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SPECIAL SERVICES. MEMBER GOTCH: AND THAT IS NOT ON --14 CHAIRMAN RELIS: IT'S NOT ON THIS TABLE. 15 16 MEMBER GOTCH: IT'S NOT ON THIS TABLE. 17 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I HAVE IT LISTED AS THE L.A. COUNTY-TYPE PROPOSAL ON -- UNDER SPECIAL 18 SERVICES. CAN WE JUST --19 20 MEMBER PENNINGTON: THAT I SAID WAS THE 21 STATEWIDE CENTER FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. 22 CHAIRMAN RELIS: STATEWIDE. I JUST WANT 23 TO MAKE SURE WE'RE ALL USING THE SAME. 24 MEMBERPENNINGTON: WHAT I'M TALKING ABOUT 25 IN TERMS OF REDUCING THE 300,000 IS ON THAT

- 1 OF PAPER THAT YOU HAVE SAYS LOCAL GOVERNMENT --
- 2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT 30-PERCENT MATCHING GRANTS TO
- 3 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ENTITLED -- ENTITIES CAN
- 4 INCLUDE, YOU KNOW, VARIOUS THINGS. AND INSTEAD OF
- 5 INCLUDING, WHICH I HAD ORIGINALLY WANTED TO DO,
- 6 WAS SOME OF THESE OTHER PRODUCTS, IN ORDER TO
- 7 REDUCE IT DOWN, I SAID WE COULD DIRECT IT AT THE
- 8 PLAYGROUND MATS.
- 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: COULD I ASK A POINT OF
- 10 CLARIFICATION. I THINK THIS WAS ALSO DISCUSSED.
- 11 THE BUSINESS ABOUT THE CAP, WELL, YOU MIGHT CALL
- 12 IT A PREFERENCE CAP FOR THE CLEANUPS AND LOCAL
- 13 GOVERNMENT CLEANUP MATCHING. THE NUMBER THAT I
- 14 BELIEVE ORIGINALLY WE HAD TALKED ABOUT THAT BEING
- 15 A 10-PERCENT CAP, BUT I BELIEVE IN FURTHER
- 16 DISCUSSIONS, A 30-PERCENT CAP WAS VIEWED AS
- 17 PERHAPS MORE OF A PULL, MORE OF THE KIND OF THE
- 18 PULL WE NEED.
- 19 MEMBER PENNINGTON: THAT'S FINE WITH ME.
- 20 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I JUST WANTED TO

CLARIFY

- 21 THAT. THAT'S THE CAP SAYING -- GIVING PREFERENCE
- 22 FOR -- IT'S A PREFERENCE.
- 23 MS. RICE: UP TO 30 PERCENT INCREASED
- 24 COST FOR CLEANUP.
- 25 MEMBER GOTCH: THANK YOU.

CHAIRMAN RELIS: RIGHT. 1 MEMBER GOTCH: IF I MAY, I NEED TO ASK, 2 3 MR. PENNINGTON, IF YOU COULD CLARIFY THE RAC 4 GRANTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, WHAT YOUR PROPOSAL 5 WAS FOR THAT AND THE PLAYGROUNDS. 6 MEMBER PENNINGTON: CERTAINLY. MY 7 ORIGINAL -- I THINK WE HAVE TO START WHERE I WAS ORIGINALLY COMING FROM. MY ORIGINAL THINKING WAS 8 TO HAVE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ABLE TO APPLY FOR A 9 10 GRANT AND SPECIFY WHAT THEY WANTED TO USE IT FOR, 11 WHETHER THEY WANTED TO USE IT FOR RUBBERIZED 12 ASPHALT, FOR PLAYGROUND MATS, FOR OTHER THINGS THAT THEY MAY FIND TO USE RECYCLED TIRES IN. 13 14 SINCE WE'RE CUTTING THAT DOLLAR FIGURE DOWN, I'M 15 WILLING TO SAY WE DIRECT IT TO THE PLAYGROUND 16 RUBBERIZED MATS. 17 MEMBER GOTCH: AND YOU WERE CUTTING THAT 18 TO WHAT AMOUNT? 19 MEMBER PENNINGTON: 300,000. 20 MEMBER GOTCH: I STILL WOULD LIKE TO 21 SEPARATE THE TWO OF THOSE, AS I SAID EARLIER. 22 CHAIRMAN RELIS: IS THERE A REASON TO 23 SEPARATE? 2.4 MEMBER GOTCH: IF I MAY, I'D LIKE TO SEE

AT LEAST \$250,000 IN MATCHING GRANTS TO SCHOOLS

1 AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS -- I'M SORRY. 2 CHAIRMAN RELIS: YOU'VE GOT 300. 3 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YOU'VE ALREADY GOT 300. YOU WANT TO DECREASE IT TO 250? 4 MEMBER GOTCH: BECAUSE I WANT TO SEPARATE 5 6 THE TWO OF THOSE, AND I WANT -- SORRY FOR MY 7 MISUNDERSTANDING THERE. WHAT I'D LIKE TO ASK, 8 THOUGH, IS THAT WE HAVE THE SEPARATE HEADING THAT 9 WILL SAY SCHOOLS, LOCALS, PLAYGROUNDS. 10 MEMBER PENNINGTON: THAT'S FINE. CHAIRMAN RELIS: INSTEAD OF LOCAL 11 12 GOVERNMENT MATCHING. 13 MEMBER PENNINGTON: SO IT SHOULD SAY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, SCHOOLS MATCHING FUNDS FOR 14 15 RUBBERIZED PLAYGROUND MATS. MS. TRGOVCICH: MR. CHAIRMAN, TO CLARIFY 16 17 AROUND THE MATCHING CONTRIBUTION PORTION, ARE WE 18 TALKING ABOUT A 30-PERCENT MATCH ON THE PART OF THE BOARD? WOULD IT BE A 70 LOCAL, 30 BOARD 19 20 SPLIT? 21 MEMBER PENNINGTON: YEAH. 22 MS. TRGOVCICH: OKAY. 23 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. IS THERE

MEMBER GOTCH: NOT AT THIS POINT.

24

25

SOMETHING ELSE?

1 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. 2 COUPLE OF JUST FURTHER THOUGHTS IN TERMS OF WE HAVE TWO CATEGORIES, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, THAT MAY 3 OR MAY NOT PAN OUT ACCORDINGLY. ONE IS THE 4 PRIORITY SITE ISSUE, THE 500,000, THE 5 6 NEGOTIATIONS, DISCUSSIONS, WE'LL NEED TO KNOW 7 WHETHER THAT WORKS. AND THE LOAN PROGRAM, WE'LL HAVE TO TEST WHETHER THE DEMAND IS THERE. 8 9 MY SUGGESTION WOULD BE IF WE FIND THAT THOSE DON'T PAN OUT ACCORDINGLY AND THE MONEY 10 IS THERE, THAT WE MAKE A DECISION, WE BRING 11 THAT -- WE GET A REPORT BACK BY, I THINK IT'S, 12 13 MAY, END OF MAY ON THE STATUS SO THAT THIS COMMITTEE AND THE BOARD CAN ACT ON HOW TO UTILIZE 14 THOSE MONIES IF THEY AREN'T USED. AND 15 SPECIFICALLY I'D RECOMMEND, IF WE HAVE MONEY FROM 16 17 THAT, THAT WE MIX IT AGAIN BOTH IN CLEANUP AND IN 18 MARKET. 19 AND IN THE MARKETS SPECIFICALLY, THE 20 AREAS THAT I THINK WE COULD UTILIZE IT MORE IS IN 21 THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AREA, IN THAT STATEWIDE TECHNICAL SERVICE CONTRACT. AND IF FOR SOME 22 23 REASON BY THAT TIME WE HAD SOME ENGINEERING 24 APPLICATION MAYBE, BUT I WOULD THINK THAT THE 25 STATEWIDE TECHNICAL SERVICE WOULD BE THE CLEANEST

1 WAY TO USE THOSE MONIES FOR MARKET DEVELOPMENT 2 SUPPLEMENT. 3 MS. RICE: WE'RE JUST SEEKING 4 CLARIFICATION. WERE YOU TALKING ABOUT THE LOAN 5 MONIES THAT HAD BEEN IDENTIFIED? LOANS DO NOT 6 COME --7 CHAIRMAN RELIS: YES. WELL, THERE'S 8 BOTH. THERE'S THE LOAN MONEY -- YOU'RE RIGHT --9 THERE'S THE LOAN MONEY AND THERE'S THE --10 MR. CHANDLER: PRIORITY SITE. 11 CHAIRMAN RELIS: -- PRIORITY SITE. SO WE HAVE A TOTAL POTENTIALLY OF, WHAT, 930,000 -- 880. 12 13 MS. RICE: SO YOU WOULD BE LOOKING AT BRINGING THESE BACK TO THE COMMITTEE IN MAY IF 14 15 THERE'S NOT A NEED DEMONSTRATED FOR THOSE FUNDS? CHAIRMAN RELIS: YEAH. SO WE HAVE A 16 17 BACKUP STRATEGY. 18 MEMBER PENNINGTON: IN OTHER WORDS, AT THE END OF MAY, IF WE STILL ARE SITTING ON 19 20 \$880,000 OR THEREABOUTS, AND IT LOOKS AS THOUGH 21 WE'RE NOT GOING TO NEED THE PRIORITY MONEY OR 22 NOBODY IS APPLYING FOR THE LOANS OR WHAT HAVE YOU, 23 THEN WE CAN REEVALUATE AND PUT IT SOMEWHERE THAT 24 IS USEFUL.

MS. RICE: GIVEN THE TIMING, THERE MAY

ΒE

1 LIMITATIONS ON THE OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO YOU WITH 2 THAT LARGE AMOUNT OF MONEY; FOR EXAMPLE, 3 AUGMENTING CONTRACTS. THAT MAYBE --CHAIRMAN RELIS: MAYBE WHAT YOU NEED TO 4 DO -- MAYBE WHAT WE NEED, WE DEFINITELY NEEDED A 5 6 BACKUP PLAN. OKAY. SO THOSE ARE A COUPLE OF 7 SUGGESTIONS OF HOW TO DO IT. MAYBE STAFF HAS --8 MAYBE THIS REQUIRES FURTHER WORK, BUT WE DON'T 9 WANT TO FIND OURSELVES AT THE ELEVENTH HOUR NOT KNOWING WHERE WE WOULD PUT MONEY IF IT SHOULD BE 10 11 THERE. 12 MS. RICE: I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S 13 APPLICABLE IN THIS SITUATION, BUT ONE OF THE SUGGESTIONS I WAS GOING TO MAKE IN THE CLEANUP 14 AREA, AND I'M NOT SUGGESTING THIS IS FOR THE 15 CLEANUP AREA. I'M JUST PRESENTING IT AS AN IDEA. 16 17 FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU HAVE IN THE CLEANUP AREA 18 IDENTIFIED THE STATE CLEANUP CONTRACT IN THE AREA OF \$750,000 AND YOU'VE ALSO IDENTIFIED MATCHING 19 20 GRANTS FOR CLEANUP, IF WE FIND TOWARDS THE MAY 21 TIME FRAME THAT THERE IS NOT SUFFICIENT INTEREST 22 IN MATCHING GRANTS, WHAT I WOULD PROPOSE IN THAT 23 AREA, THEN, IS JUST AN IDEA FOR YOU TO THINK ABOUT 24 IF IT APPLIES TO THIS OTHER SITUATION, WE WOULD

SUGGEST PERHAPS THE INITIAL SOLICITATION FOR THE

1 STATE CLEANUP CONTRACT BEING AT A HIGHER LEVEL SO 2 THAT THE FUNDS ARE NOT THERE, YOU HAVE NOT 3 INDICATED A HIGHER LEVEL OF FUNDING IS THERE, SO THAT WOULD GIVE US THE ABILITY, GIVE YOU THE 4 5 ABILITY WITHOUT SUBSEQUENT ACTION TO MAKE THOSE 6 FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR THAT PURPOSE. 7 SO ONE THING YOU MIGHT BE ABLE TO 8 LOOK AT IN THE MARKET DEVELOPMENT AREA, IF THAT'S 9 YOUR INTEREST, IF ONE OF THE CONTRACTS THAT YOU ENTER INTO IN THAT AREA, TO DO THE SOLICITATION AT 10 A HIGHER LEVEL WITH THE THOUGHT IN MIND THAT 11 ADDITIONAL FUNDS MAY BECOME AVAILABLE IN THE 12 13 APRIL, MAY, JUNE TIME FRAME. JUST A SUGGESTION. 14 MEMBER PENNINGTON: I THINK WHAT WE'RE 15 LOOKING FOR IS FLEXIBILITY THERE TO MOVE THAT 16 AROUND. 17 MS. TRGOVCICH: LIKEWISE, WITH THE LOAN 18 COMPONENT, YOU MAY WISH -- YOU MAY BE IDENTIFYING TODAY 400 -- I THINK I'VE LOST TRACK WHAT THE 19 20 DOLLAR AMOUNT WOULD BE --\$380,000 THAT WOULD BE 21 AVAILABLE FOR APPLICATIONS FOR TIRE-RELATED 22 BUSINESSES THROUGH THE RMDZ PROGRAM. YOU MAY WANT 23 TO SAY 380 NOW AND IT CAN GO UP TO A CERTAIN 24 I HAVE \$9 MILLION WORTH OF APPLICATIONS IN LEVEL.

25

RIGHT NOW.

1 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO THAT WOULDN'T BE A 2 FARFETCHED PROPOSAL. 3 MEMBER PENNINGTON: BECAUSE NINE MILLION 4 AREN'T ALL FOR THE TIRE FUND. 5 MS. TRGOVCICH: THEY'RE ALL TIRE-RELATED 6 BUSINESSES. 7 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I THINK, THEN, THOUGH WE 8 HAVE NOT ACTED AS YET ON THE ACTUAL ALLOCATIONS, 9 YOU HAVE A STATEMENT OF DIRECTION. AND THAT COULD BE REFINED SO THAT WE HAVE A BACKUP STRATEGY 10 11 THAT'S SUFFICIENTLY DETAILED AND WORKABLE TO MOVE 12 QUICKLY ON AND NOT LOSE, BEARING IN MIND, AND I 13 THINK I JUST SAY THIS FOR THE AUDIENCE OUT THERE, WE HAVE LIMITED DOLLARS THIS YEAR. WE'RE MUCH 14 MORE CONSTRAINED RIGHT NOW THAN WE'RE GOING TO BE 15 NEXT, NOT THAT FAR OFF. IN SEVEN MONTHS OR EIGHT 16 17 MONTHS, IF THE BUDGET IS SIGNED AT THAT POINT, WE 18 HAVE A GREAT DEAL MORE MONEY NEXT YEAR. THAT'S 19 PARTLY WHY WE'RE STRUGGLING WITH -- WITHIN A 20 NARROW BAND THIS YEAR. SO WE HAVE A PROPOSAL ON 21 THE TABLE. 22 MEMBER PENNINGTON: DO YOU WISH ME TO 23 MAKE THAT IN A MOTION? 24 CHAIRMAN RELIS: YES.

MEMBER PENNINGTON: DO YOU WANT ME TO GO

1 THROUGH IT AGAIN OR JUST --2 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I THINK MAYBE WE SHOULD 3 JUST ONCE MORE. MEMBER PENNINGTON: OKAY. THE PILOT LEA 4 5 GRANTS, 200,000; THE HIGHWAY PATROL, A HUNDRED 6 THOUSAND; THE DMV, 15,000; STATEWIDE CLEANUP AND 7 REMEDIATION, 750,000; THE EMERGENCY FUND AT 8 250,000, WHICH WE'RE GOING TO ZERO OUT. 9 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO SHOULD WE JUST SAY 10 ZERO NOW? 11 MEMBER PENNINGTON: HOWEVER YOU LIKE, JUST SO WE ARE CLEAR WHERE THE MONEY IS COMING 12 13 FROM. 14 LOCAL GOVERNMENT MATCHING CLEANUP 15 GRANTS, 250; FIRE MARSHAL, HUNDRED THOUSAND. MARKET DEVELOPMENT AREA, THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT, 16 17 SCHOOL MATCHING GRANTS FOR RUBBER PLAYGROUND MATS, 18 300,000; STATEWIDE CENTER FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, 500,000; FINANCIAL SERVICES, 50,000; 19 20 COAL CO-GEN TESTING, 200,000; CEMENT KILN 21 INFORMATION, 50,000; RMDZ LOANS, 380,000; AND A 22 \$500,000 PRUDENT RESERVE. 23 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I'LL SECOND THAT. 24 MEMBER PENNINGTON: THANK YOU.

MEMBER RELIS: MS. GOTCH.

1 MEMBER GOTCH: YEAH. I HAVE A COUPLE OF SUGGESTIONS I'D LIKE TO MAKE, ALTHOUGH THE MOTION 2 3 HAS BEEN SECONDED, FOR CONSIDERATION, TO ALLOW THE 4 EMERGENCY FUND, TO KEEP \$150,000 IN THE EMERGENCY 5 FUND. I'M TRYING TO REMEMBER THE DIFFERENCE б BETWEEN THE TWO. AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS, MR. PENNINGTON, I'M SORRY. WILL YOU REPEAT THE AMOUNT 7 8 THAT YOU HAD FOR THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS? 9 MEMBER PENNINGTON: LOCAL GOVERNMENT 10 CLEANUP MATCHING GRANTS, I HAVE 250,000. 11 MEMBER GOTCH: THANK YOU. 12 MS. RICE: MS. GOTCH, I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S OF ASSISTANCE TO YOU, BUT ONE THING WE MAY BE 13 14 ABLE TO LOOK AT IN THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE 15 CLEANUP CONTRACT, WE CAN CERTAINLY IDENTIFY A CATEGORY OF EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND WITH SOME 16 17 QUALIFIERS AROUND THAT AS SOMETHING THAT'S APPROPRIATE TO DO WITH STATE CLEANUP DOLLARS, 18 19 WHICH IS THE SOURCE WE'VE BEEN GOING TO DATE FOR 20 THOSE KINDS OF SITUATIONS ANYWAY. JUST TO PUT 21 FORWARD THAT THERE MAY NOT BE A NECESSITY FOR A 22 SEPARATE POT, SO LONG AS YOU MAKE IT CLEAR THAT 23 YOU WANT FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR CERTAIN TYPES OF 24 SITUATIONS THROUGH YOUR ORDINARY CONTRACTING.

MEMBER GOTCH: THANK YOU. AND I THINK

- 1 THAT THAT IS IT. THANK YOU. 2 CHAIRMAN RELIS: OKAY. WE HAVE A MOTION. 3 WE'LL CALL THE ROLL. 4 THE SECRETARY: MEMBER GOTCH. 5 MEMBER GOTCH: (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE.) 6 THE SECRETARY: MEMBER PENNINGTON. 7 MEMBER PENNINGTON: AYE. 8 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN RELIS. MEMBER GOTCH: I HAVEN'T VOTED. I JUST 9 10 NEED ONE SECOND. I'M JUST GOING OVER MY NUMBERS. 11 I'M SORRY. 12 AYE. 13 CHAIRMAN RELIS: IT'S UNANIMOUS. WE HAVE 14 RESOLVED THE ALLOCATION IN COMMITTEE. THIS WILL 15 GO TO THE BOARD AT ITS FULL BOARD MEETING, AND I 16 DON'T BELIEVE THIS WOULD BE CONSENT. 17 MEMBER PENNINGTON: NO. 18 CHAIRMAN RELIS: WE COULD TRY, BUT I 19 DON'T THINK THERE'S ANY POINT IN PUTTING IT ON 20 CONSENT, SO WE'LL PASS THAT FORWARD. AND LET'S 21 SEE, THAT BRINGS US --
- GOING TO LEGAL ON, AND I DON'T KNOW IF KATHRYN IS PREPARED TO ANSWER THIS YET, BUT IF WE CAN HAVE

HAVE A QUESTION THAT I HAD ASKED STAFF THEY WERE

MEMBER GOTCH: MR. CHAIR, IF I MAY, I

22

1 STAFF LOOK INTO THE SAN FRANCISCO PROGRAM THAT DR. 2 BARRY TAKALLOU MENTIONED. DO YOU HAVE AN ANSWER 3 FOR THAT ALREADY? MS. TRGOVCICH: I BRIEFLY SPOKE WITH SOME 4 5 OF THE LEGAL STAFF YESTERDAY. WHAT MS. GOTCH IS 6 REFERRING TO THAT UNDER THE '95-'96 GRANT CYCLE 7 THAT THE BOARD INITIATED, THERE WERE SUFFICIENT 8 FUNDS AVAILABLE TO GO SO FAR DOWN THE A LIST. SAN 9 FRANCISCO DID NOT RECEIVE THEIR FULL ALLOCATION. AS MR. TAKALLOU STATED, THEY RECEIVED ABOUT A 10 \$30,000 ALLOCATION OUT OF A \$97,000 REQUEST. 11 12 MS. GOTCH'S QUESTION IS IF IN THROUGH THE '96-7 FUNDS, IF THE BOARD COULD FULLY 13 FUND THE SAN FRANCISCO PROPOSAL, FULLY FUND A SAN 14 FRANCISCO PROPOSAL AWARDED UNDER A '95-'96 GRANT 15 CYCLE WITH '96-'97 DOLLARS. PRELIMINARILY OUR 16 17 INTERPRETATION IS THAT THERE WOULD NEED TO BE A 18 NEW GRANT CYCLE, A NEW AWARD SOLICITATION PROCESS THAT WOULD NEED TO BE INITIATED. THESE ARE 19 20 DIFFERENT YEAR DOLLARS. 21 CHAIRMAN RELIS: THERE WERE OTHER GRANTS 22 THAT WERE NOT FULLY ALLOCATED, SO WOULDN'T WE 23 BE -- HOW WOULD WE DO THAT EVEN PROCEDURALLY IF WE

MEMBER GOTCH: I DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S A

24

25

WANTED TO DO THAT?

1

FACT.

2 MS. TRGOVCICH: I DON'T THINK IT HAS 3 ANYTHING TO DO WITH THAT. I THINK THAT THE -- AND I'LL DEFER TO KATHRYN, BUT THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE 4 5 OF WHETHER OR NOT OTHER GRANTS WERE FULLY FUNDED 6 OR NOT HASN'T BEEN THE ISSUE WE'VE BEEN FOCUSING 7 ON; IT'S THE DOLLAR YEARS AND THE GRANT CYCLES. 8 CHAIRMAN RELIS: SO YOUR -- LEGAL'S TAKE 9 IS IT WOULD REQUIRE A NEW CYCLE TO DO THAT? MS. TOBIAS: WELL, BASICALLY YOU 10 ADVERTISED FOR A GIVEN AMOUNT OF MONEY. PEOPLE 11 12 HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO APPLY FOR THAT. AND NOW 13 YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT TAKING NEXT YEAR'S MONEY AND FUNDING IT BACK ONTO THE PREVIOUS YEAR. 14 15 BASICALLY WHAT YOU NEED TO DO IS GO THROUGH A NEW GRANT CYCLE. IF THEY WOULD LIKE TO APPLY AGAIN 16 17 AND YOU WOULD LIKE THEM TO, YOU KNOW, IT'S IMPORTANT FOR YOU TO SEE THAT FUNDED AND THAT'S 18 Α 19 HIGH PRIORITY, YOU CAN CERTAINLY SET YOUR OWN 20 CRITERIA ON HOW YOU WOULD LIKE TO GIVE OUT THOSE

| 21 | GRANTS. |
|----------|--|
| 22 | MEMBER GOTCH: UNDERSTOOD. WHAT I |
| WANT | |
| 23 | TO KNOW IS IF WE CAN EARMARK ANY RESIDUAL MONEY |
| 24 25 | FROM THE '95-'96 FOR COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT. IS THERE RESIDUAL? |

| 1 | MR. CHANDLER: WELL, WE JUST AWARDED |
|--------|--|
| THE | |
| 2 | GRANTS NOT THAT LONG AGO. I BELIEVE IT WAS IN |
| MAY | |
| 3 | OR APRIL. AND SO A FUNCTION OF WHETHER OR NOT |
| 4 | EVERY GRANT THAT'S BEEN JUST AWARDED HAS FULLY |
| 5 | ENCUMBERED OR UTILIZED THE FUNDING WOULD BE |
| 6 | SOMETHING, I THINK, THAT WE'D HAVE MORE OF A |
| FEEL | |
| 7 | FOR AT THE END OF THE GRANT TERM. RIGHT NOW I |
| 8 | COULDN'T TELL IF WE HAVE ANY AVAILABLE DOLLARS |
| ON | |
| 9 | THOSE GRANTS. |
| 10 | MS. RICE: IT ALSO BECOMES A BUDGET |
| ISSUE | |
| 11 | AND COMPLICATION IN TERMS OF SEEKING |
| EXPEND | ITURE |
| 12 | AUTHORITY. I MEAN YOU NOTE THAT ON THE |
| DIFFER | ENT |
| 13 | BUDGET CHARTS, WE SHOW BCP REQUESTS FOR EACH |
| YEAR | |
| 14 | USING THAT EXACTLY, THAT UNSPENT MONIES FROM |
| THE | |
| 15 | PRIOR YEAR. SO YOU ARE REQUIRED TO GO BACK |
| | |

THROUGH THE BUDGET ACT AND SEEK AUTHORITY TO

SPEND

- 17 IT. AND THEN IF YOU DECIDE YOU WANT TO DO A GRANT
- 18 SOLICITATION WITH IT, THAT'S THE SEQUENCE THAT YOU
- 19 WOULD ORDINARILY FOLLOW.
- MS. TRGOVCICH: IF THIS WAS STILL A

PART

- OF THE '95-'96 FISCAL YEAR, WHICH IS THE ITEM
 THAT
- 22 YOU ARE SUGGESTING WOULD BE SOMETHING THAT, YOU
- 23 KNOW, WE WOULD CERTAINLY BRING BACK TO YOU, BUT
- 24 WE'RE PAST THAT FISCAL YEAR AND THAT BUDGET CYCLE.
- 25 CHAIRMAN RELIS: MAYBE ONE WAY TO JUST

1 WE'VE DEALT WITH THE ALLOCATION, SO PERHAPS ONE WAY TO LOOK AT, IF SOMETHING WERE TO COME UP --2 3 YOU KNOW, WE'RE GOING TO GET A REPORT BACK IN MAY, 4 CONSIDER IT AT THAT TIME ALONG WITH THE OTHER 5 OPTIONS THAT ARE THERE BECAUSE I DON'T SEE THAT 6 THERE'S, ASSUMING, AGAIN, IF WE WANTED TO DO IT, I 7 DON'T THINK THERE'S A CLEAR WAY TO DO IT FROM WHAT 8 I'M HEARING FROM STAFF. 9 MEMBER GOTCH: THE REASON I'M ASKING 10 THIS, I THINK YOU UNDERSTAND, IS THAT TO BE ABLE 11 TO -- THIS IS AN IMPORTANT PROJECT FOR NORTHERN 12 CALIFORNIA, AND WE HAVE A LOT GOING ON DOWN IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AT THIS TIME WITH A LOT OF 13 14 MONEY GOING DOWN TO THAT AREA. 15 CHAIRMAN RELIS: I WOULD JUST POINT OUT, WE'RE NOT -- I DON'T THINK OUR DISCUSSION OF THE 16 17 EFFORT IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA IS VIEWED AS 18 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ONLY. I MEAN WE'RE LOOKING AT 19 IT AS BEING A STATEWIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE EFFORT. WE EVEN HEARD, I THINK, FROM MR. TAKALLOU 20 21 THAT THE SAN FRANCISCO AREA WOULD LOOK TO THIS 22 EFFORT AS A VALUABLE ASSISTANCE TO THEIR OWN 23 PROGRAMS IN SAN FRANCISCO. SO I JUST OFFER THAT

MEMBER GOTCH: THANK YOU.

24

25

AS A PERSPECTIVE.

| 1 | CHAIRMAN RELIS: ALL RIGHT. I BELIEVE |
|----------|---|
| 2 | WE'RE DONE WITH |
| 3 | MEMBER PENNINGTON: MR. CHAIRMAN, IF YOU |
| 4 | DON'T MIND, BEFORE WE ADJOURN, I'D JUST LIKE TO |
| 5 | ANNOUNCE THAT WITHIN ABOUT 15 MINUTES AFTER THIS |
| 6 | MEETING, WE WILL THEN CONVENE THE ADMINISTRATION |
| 7 | COMMITTEE, WHICH WAS SET FOR 1:30. |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN RELIS: AND IN CLOSING, I'D JUST |
| 9 | LIKE TO THANK EVERYONE WHO HAS APPEARED TODAY AND |
| 10 | PREVIOUSLY TO MAKE THEIR CASE BEFORE US ON THE |
| 11 | ALLOCATIONS AND TO STAFF FOR DOING AN EXCELLENT |
| 12 | JOB IN PREPARING FOR THIS MEETING. THANK YOU. |
| 13 | |
| 14 | (END OF PROCEEDINGS AT 2:05 P.M.) |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 25 | |